Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 1956 W. Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-24 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Volume 61 St. Louis, Mo. March 1, 1933

THE PASTOR AND THE NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS

By Theophil Menzel, M.A., B.D.

A few decades ago the theological seminary which deemed it necessary to impart to its students a knowledge of the non-Christian religions was an exceptional school. Today the seminary which has no department of comparative religion is considered a back-number. Is this change just another modern fad or has it grown out of a real need? The first qeustion which many might ask is: "Is there any practical sense in cramming another field of study into the already ponderous amount of things which a theological student is supposed to digest?" Aside from the fact that our "practicality" is often another word for superficiality and short-sightedness, it might be said that in this twentieth century the study of comparative religion meets a need which we must take into consideration if our pastoral work is to be intelligent and practical. I take it that the primary task of an American seminary is not to breed philosophers or to promote theological debates, but to equip men to lead their parishioners into a fuller and more Christlike relationship to God and to their fellowmen. And it is for this very reason that the study of comparative religion meets a vital need in our own day.

Many will no doubt shrug their shoulders at such a statement. So let us enumerate some of the reasons why this field of study has a real practical bearing upon the work of a modern pastor.

It has a very direct bearing upon the intellectual problems which a minister must himself face. This is a practical problem even though it be "intellectual," for the character of a pastor's min-

istry is in part directly moulded by his world-view. No young man who is in touch with modern thought-currents can complete his studies for the ministry without raising the question: "Is Christianity, of all of the religions which have motivated men, the religion which is able to meet our deepest needs?" If he is intellectually honest he cannot be dogmatic. His conviction must be able to stand the test of a fair and appreciative study of the other great faiths. The modern youth is not content to accept a dogmatic distinction between "true" and "false" religions. He wants to know why we call the one true and the other false. Can he decide this question without some knowledge of the facts? In the final analysis, of course, this involves more than a merely intellectual weighing of vices and virtues in the religions of mankind. It is ultimately a spiritual choice of the whole man and yet the leader in religious thought can be expected to make this choice only after he has honestly considered the facts in question. If his Christian beliefs are not strong enough to stand a fair comparison with any other beliefs which men have held, then his ministry will be built upon the sands of indecision.

Then too, he must not forget that to some degree his parishioners are facing the same questions. If people are not afraid to shock the pastor they will show that they do compare their religion with non-Christian religions. Young people especially are thinking along this line. They expect a pastor to know not only what he believes, but why he believes it in the face of the differing beliefs of other men. It is often quite astounding to notice the amount of questions of this type which may come from people whom we often regard as "simple-minded" folk. Who has not heard the question from laymen: "Don't all religions aim for the same things? What difference does it make, if men are sincere?"

Another consideration which makes the knowledge of other faiths more urgent is the very evident fact that the world is becoming a small place. The same ease of communication which makes it possible for us to know what is happening in India today also makes it possible for Indian religion to reach us. Today these religions are at our door-steps. Most of the organized non-Christian religions have missionaries proclaiming their beliefs among us. They have their mosques and temples in our large centers just as we have our mission churches in their native lands. Christianity no longer lives in isolation. At the time of its birth Christianity was opposed by a great legion of religions. The Roman Empire brought all of the religions of the Near East into contact with each other. Modern inventions are doing the same thing to the world today and Christianity must once more face a similar siuation.

Boundaries of geography, culture and race no longer keep us apart. A few months ago, as I sat in the parlor of one of my former parishioners, I heard a native of India preaching over the radio about the saving help of the Indian God Ganesh. All one had to do was to purchase a little idol for the sum of two dollars and the Great Ganesh would be kind and avert misfortune from our lives! The time is not distant when the preaching of every religion of the globe may reach our ears in our own homes. How can we then ignore them?

Many of the religious cults which are springing up in the Occident have been influenced by the thought-forms of the Orient. Where is there a pastor who has not had to face the teachings of Theosophy, Christian Science, Spiritualism, Bahaism, etc.? In Europe Oriental religions are making their influence felt through such movements as Anthroposophy, neo-Buddhism, Mazdasnan and others. To say then, that we do not need to know anything about other religions is to fail to recognize a very real situation.

We need a greater knowledge of other faiths because the church conducts a great missionary enterprise. At home a pastor is told that he must understand the life of his parishioners if he is to be of help to them. We have often failed to observe this principle when we sought to minister to the souls of men in foreign lands. Sometimes we did not try to understand them because we assumed that there was nothing about them that was worth trying to understand. As a consequence some missionaries developed a very superior attitude which prevented them from being of greatest service to their non-Christian brothers. Such missionaries are of course unpleasant exceptions, but they form the target of a great deal of criticism which is unjustly directed at the work of foreign missions in general. E. Stanley Jones has expressed a more brotherly and humble attitude when he says to the people of Asia: "No longer can we face the East with a sense of superiority. It is with a deep sense of our own need. We do not strive to impose our civilization upon the East. We say to the man of the East: 'We do not come to you because you are the worst in the world, but because you are a part of the world. We believe in a world that is Christlike, we know nothing better; so, because you are a part of the world, we come to you. But, if there were not ten thousand working at the task at the home base, we would not come to you. We come because we are all in the same deep human need." When we come to our brothers overseas in this spirit we cannot help but understand them better. For this reason many a young missionary, after his arrival upon the field, has regretted that he did not take time to inform himself beforehand concerning the classical religions of the country to which he has gone.

An objective study of the best in these religions would make much of our missionary preaching at home more fair to natives of missionary lands. There are some preachers who seek to inspire laymen to support missions by heaping abuse upon non-Christian peoples. They deny any trace of kindliness, common-sense morality, a sense of responsibility or truthfulness to the "heathen." They blissfully state that this or that teaching is the exclusive contribution of Christianity when such teachings may have been written black on white in the classical scriptures of such religions long before any contact was made with Christian missionaries. How often does one hear the statement made that the Golden Rule is exclusively Christian, although it was proclaimed in China before the Christian Era? The missionary enterprise does not need, nor want such evident unfairness. It thrives on a spirit of brotherliness, not abuse.

In this way we simply reveal a trait very common to mortals. We continually compare the best in us with the worst in others, and then praise heaven for our superiority! We set up an imaginary perfect Christian and compare him to an equally imaginary worthless pagan. Is there any fairness in comparing an American saint with an Indian scoundrel? We compare the American adoration of womanhood with the former Indian practice of widow-burning. Of course the contrast is appalling but why not be fair enough to compare an American lynching or a race riot with an Indian widow-burning? It will be said of course that a lynching or a race riot is not Christian. But neither are many of the things we ascribe to non-Christians expressive of their highest religious insights.

We must learn to realize that there are various grades of perfection within any religion. One might compare the superstitious mood of Tibetan Buddhism with the spirituality of our best Christians. But this is obviously unfair. Buddhists are not all upon this level. We would feel deeply grieved to hear a Buddhist missionary compare the benevolent spirituality of a Buddhist gentleman to the crass superstition of a Mexican peon who calls himself a Christian because he has bought himself a crucifix, or to a European pirate captain several centuries ago who made his sailors attend a prayer meeting on deck just before attacking a vessel so that they might pray God to grant them success in their bloody ventures. Christianity's claim upon the hearts of men does not need to employ such arguments. We are not afraid to compare our best with their best. But we cannot make an honest comparison unless we have informed ourselves in a spirit of Christian fairness.

One of the most rewarding insights which may come to a pastor as a result of a study of comparative religion is the under-

standing of primitive elements which survive in the minds of people in spite of centuries of Christian background. Every religion embraces believers who are on different levels of spiritual development. Some of the religious traits of church members may be primitive traits. The pastor whose perception has been made keen by a study of primitive religions will be confronted day after day with primitive elements in the religious life of his people.

Spengler has made the daring statement that the peasant has no history. He does not change from generation to generation and so it is impossible to record his history. Such a statement is apparently an over-simplification of the facts, but there is an element of truth in it. We seldom realize how many primitive traits have survived in the minds of unreflective church members in spite of centuries of church affiliation. The fact that these primitive attitudes may be clothed in Christian terminology should not deceive us. Words are only vessels into which each man pours a content which is determined by what wells up within him. It is always easier to observe the vessel than to note the nature of the source.

A very characteristic feature of primitive spiritual life is the intermingling of religious and magical motives. Religion and magic are so closely blended in primitive life that it is often very difficult to distinguish them. Anthropologists who confine themselves to the study of primitive life often fail to see any distinction between magic and religion. But the difference is a clear-cut one when judged according to its actual motive and not merely according to outward form. Magic seeks to control life by a simple assertion of the will without any rational realization of the true nature of cause and effect. If you knock on wood you are seeking to control a certain situation without going to the true cause of the matter. Magic is man's attempt to give commands to the universe. The underlying motive of religion is quite different. Religion seeks fellowship with the source and heart of existence. It involves a sense of value which magic entirely disregards. True religion does not command God, it enters into fellowship with him. If the religious man has desires he prays rather than to attempt to coerce. "Thy will be done" is the very opposite of the magical mood. But the distinction between religion and magic cannot be judged according to outward forms. Repeating the trinitarian formula may be a confession of religious faith or it may be a magic spell. The Lord's prayer may be repeated as a genuine prayer or it may be used as a magic spell, as we often find it used in degenerate and stagnant groups.

Observe the motives of men and you will find that much magic is concealed by religious terminology and forms. The attitude of many of our parishioners toward the sacraments is a magical atti-

tude at least in part. Let us enumerate a few examples. A woman is anxious to have her baby baptized. Why? She states that it is bad luck for a mother to leave the house until the baby is baptized, and she wants to go shopping next week! Another woman states that it is time for the minister to come and drive the bad spirits out of her child. How much magic is involved in so-called emergency baptisms? In the minds of many people the minister is a medicine-man. If the doctor's treatment does not work, perhaps baptism will cure the child. A certain family kept the baptismal water after the ceremony and gave it to the child to drink whenever it became sick. Thus the attitude of magic lives on in religious garments. The real purpose of baptism hardly enters into the situation in such cases.

In respect to the sacrament of Holy Communion the same thing holds. Pastors are called to the sick-room to administer communion. Why? The actual motives may differ as much as day and night. There are some cases where communion is desired for much the same reasons that an African bushman calls the medicine-man. I was once called to the bedside of a woman who had suffered a stroke. She desired communion and afterwards the husband was very much concerned because she did not drink all of the wine out of the cup. When I asked him why, he replied: "It might help more if she drank it all." To him communion was not communion, but a mysterious medicine. The doctor had told them that her case was hopeless but they tried communion as another form of medicine. They used a religious form, not to meet a situation in a religious attitude, but in the hope that it might have a magic power to cure. On another occasion I was called to the hospital to administer communion to a woman who had been injured in an accident. She had been totally unconscious for over a week. When I attempted to explain why communion would be impossible under the circumstances they replied: "But we want to see if communion won't work." In such cases a sacrament is used for an alien purpose. But even in cases where it is desired for a higher purpose its operation is frequently looked upon, not as a spiritual process, but as a magic act. To many minds forgiveness of sins follows, not as a result of a new relationship to God or as a result of God's grace, but merely as a result of partaking of definite material objects under particular outward circumstances.

The same magical mood is present at times in the conception that people have of the whole purpose of religious life. "I told you you would have bad luck if you don't go to church" a mother said to her son. In fact the whole idea of salvation by works is a magical conception. If you do certain things God must do certain things for you. Sometimes we pastors are guilty of fostering such a spirit

by giving an unbalanced emphasis to the mundane benefits to be derived from godliness. Much popular "stewardship" teaching is of this type.

How much primitive paganism is associated with common funeral customs? We read with repugnance of the Indian father who must thrust his family into indebtedness for a whole generation in order to provide a "proper" wedding feast at the marriage of his daughter. Yet we often have the same situation in America in regard to funerals. We all know of cases where children were denied an education because someone in the family was given a "proper" burial which poured the earnings of a life-time into the pockets of undertakers and florists. The meticulous care given by many poor people to the problem of having a casket and burial vault which will preserve the body of the deceased shows the materialistic conception of the life after death which they have. How similar it all is to the elaborate care of the dead among many primitive people! Primitive religion finds it difficult to break through the bonds of materialism.

The study of other religions is valuable, finally, because it enables us to return with a renewed appreciation of the true nature of Christianity. A student of comparative religion is at first surprised to find that there is hardly a doctrine which Christianity proclaims which cannot be duplicated in another religion. But does this mean that Christianity has nothing unique to give to the world? This might be true if we could leave Christ out of Christianity. Religion finds its highest fulfilment not in doctrines or institutions or cultural contributions, but in personality. And yet we so often try to make the doctrines of Christianity its vital point. If doctrines were all, then Christianity would have to take a place alongside of other religions. But doctrines do not express the highest values. Christ is more than anything he taught. Each of the classical religions have ideals, but humanity seeks the ideal not as an abstract idea but in a person.

The disciple Thomas once said to Jesus: "How know we the way?" Jesus answered: "I am the way and the truth and the life." I suppose that Thomas was thinking of a certain set of regulations for living or a map of their future operations, but Jesus points to himself. The true way is not a law but a person. Jesus not only said: "I will show you the way" but rather, "I am the way." He did not promise them, "I will tell you all of the truth" but he did say, "I am the truth." Neither did he merely promise: "I will show you life" but rather, "I am the life." Christ is our religion. Only when we regard him as the very heart of Christianity do we see the vast differences which separate him from any creed or teaching ever proclaimed by men.

THE APOSTOLIC CREED, ITS PLACE AND SIGNIFICANCE IN TWENTIETH CENTURY CHRISTIANITY

By Rev. W. Bechtold

The most deplorable condition existing in the Protestant Church of the twentieth century is a confusion of thought and lack of conviction for which the pulpit is partly to blame. The by-products of Christianity are unduly stressed, while the great fundamentals of Christian truth, and the most vital tenets of our religion are set aside. It is undoubtedly true that the Christian religion, being life, must, and does, produce and promote a practical Christian life which brings forth these by-products, but the fountain of such life lies within the inner recesses of the heart in which there is treasured up a sacred store of deep and earnest convictions.

A really active Christian life comes not from the mere intellectual acceptance of religious facts or theological tenets, but out of the faith that is produced in the heart by the revelation of divine truth. Such divine truth forms the basis of the Creed which the Trinitarian Churches believe, teach and confess throughout Christendom. Without such a Creed, or formulated belief, Christian life lacks foundation. No man can be a Christian without a definite form of belief. Now some seem to hold creeds altogether unnecessary. Others declare them to be outworn or outgrown, no longer acceptable to Christians of this enlightened age. But if we define a creed as the intellectual statement of religious facts and principles which guides conduct, it becomes essential for the practical life of those confessing it, and gives direction to their faith. We believe that the Apostles' Creed comes under this definition. Therefore Christians of the twentieth century have need of it as well as those of the early Church.

Accordingly the Apostles' Creed is not only not to be set aside as time-worn, obsolete, and valueless, but rather to be restored to its rightful place in the teaching and preaching, as well as the worship and life of the Church of Jesus Christ. Wherever the foundation truths, as embodied in the Creed, are ignored or denied, the Church will suffer, for all that outward activity which so many mistake for genuine Christian life will be without a real inner motive. We may thus have "churchianity," but not Christianity. *The underlying basis of the Christian life of individuals, and the very fountain of spiritual life in the Christian Church at large, is the Creed universally accepted by Trinitarian Churches, the Apostles' Creed.*

I.

"The Apostles' Creed is a body of Christian doctrine which, like a stream, flowed from that same apostolic fountain which gave us the Gospels, the Epistles, and the remainder of the New Testament." (Edwards). Every Biblical fact and every tenet of faith confessed in this Creed is based on very definite and explicit passages of Scripture. These can not be misunderstood, nor misinterpreted; nor are they faulty or wrong translations of the original text.

In accordance with the Scriptural doctrine of the Holy Trinity, we have three divisions, or "Articles" in the Apostolic Creed, the first of these stating the Church's belief in God, the Father and Creator. What this Article states is so self-evident to all who have experienced God, that it seems unnecessary to make any defense of this Article of our Christian faith. Nevertheless, we ask this question: "Is this true?" "I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth." Has science disproved this? Has psychology eliminated God? Is God still entitled to the credit of having created the universe? Should the world make ten thousand times the progress in the next three decades which it has made in the first three decades of the twentieth century, God will not be discredited as Creator or dethroned as the Ruler of the universe. Millions will still confess as they do today: "I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth." Not only will they confess it because they believe it, but because they are daily experiencing God.

Belief in God gives us *a better understanding of the Scriptures.* The Bible would be a meaningless book, of little value in practical life, merely a volume of more or less literary value.

Belief in God *helps us to understand nature.* That all we see has been created by a great divine Intelligence, leaving no room for cold fate or haphazard chance, but doing all for a purpose and in orderliness, with scientific precision.

And belief in God, the Creator of the universe and the eternal Ruler of all mankind's destinies, helps us *to understand history.* How can we conceive of a world peopled with millions of intelligent beings left to the fate of circumstances and events under no one's control? History, seemingly a chaotic piling up of events—good and evil—,ghastly procession of wars and their attendant horrors, a terrifying array of calamities and crimes; history, imagine it without God! The reins of world history in the hands of a cold fate! But no—there is a God who will at last bring order out of chaos and cause all things to work together for the ultimate universal good.

Does not the world need such a God today as the ruling Factor in the turbulent restlessness and bewildering procession of kaleidoscopic events of our time?

And lastly, we need God in order *to understand experience.* We can not truly believe in God without experiencing Him, nor can we understand our experiences in life without God.

We find satisfaction in a belief which postulates God; it gives us an explanation for many things, otherwise difficult to understand. But when we experience God as a living Force by which our lives are given impetus, direction and purpose, we acquiesce in the wisdom of His ways, and trust in His love, to do all things for the ultimate good of His children and to His own glory.

Twentieth century Christians can not leave God out of their reckoning, nor eliminate Him from their Creed.

II.

It is impossible, in the space allotted for this article, to enter into a discussion of every fact and doctrine of the second Article. In treating of the Christ of the Creed, we shall endeavor to answer the question: *Does twentieth century Christianity have a place for the Christ of the Creed, and of what significance is He to present day Christians?*

What is stated concerning Christ evidently serves a threefold purpose, viz.—

1. To present *Christ as the very image of the Father,* so that in Christ we are face to face with God.

2. To emphasize *the vicarious sacrifice of Christ.* The events connected with this are enumerated, evidently to point out their essentiality.

3. To present in *Christ our noblest challenge and highest inspiration* for worthy service and a purposeful destination.

In regard to *the first purpose* it may be said, that it is well founded in the words of Christ to Philip: "Who hath seen Me, hath seen the Father." Christ, the Son, is the very incarnation of the Father. In Christ God came to earth, that He might reveal Himself in person to mankind. Christ entered the world in a natural way, yet also in a miraculous way; in a natural way, inasmuch as He was born of a woman, in a miraculous way, because not conceived "by the will of a man," but by the Holy Spirit, and born of a virgin. "Jesus Christ was conceived by the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary; He thus entered human nature etc." (Evan. Catechism, revised edition, Question 62).

Of all the creedal doctrines the doctrine of *the Virgin Birth* is most assailed by modern liberal theologians. Yet it offers no

obstacle to faith in Christ as the Saviour. On the contrary, its acceptance by faith makes the Saviourhood of Christ an undisputed certainty. We can not conceive of a Christ otherwise born as being the Saviour. Furthermore, this doctrine is just as Scriptural as any other, and no more difficult to believe than any other, e.g., the resurrection of the body, life everlasting, etc. Let us revert to Scripture as we consider this vital doctrine. What doctrine is more plainly set forth in the Scriptures, than the Virgin Birth, as involved in the fact recorded in Matthew 1: 18 and the following verses? And Luke, the physician, who as such might have rejected it as impossible, records the fact of the Virgin Birth in chapter 1: 26-38 in language that is reverent, yet clear. There is only one alternative: Reject these portions of Scripture under any pretense, and the authority of all the Scriptures is endangered. The only back door open to those who would reject the doctrne of the Virgin Birth is the denial of the inspiration of the Scriptures in general. Deny the inspiration of the Scriptures, and you may as well relegate the Bible to some remote corner, and instead read Shakespeare and Browning, Schiller and Goethe, and study the writings of great philosophers and historians, for in these, no doubt, we find many high ideals and much inspiration for good and noble lives.

But if we feel the needs of the immortal soul within us, and want salvation, we will hold fast to the inspiration of the Holy Scripture and accept even the unbelievable and inexplicable doctrines, such as the Virgin Birth, et al. For if we would accept only the doctrines we can understand, we would have to reject a good many more.

We sum up the discussion of this doctrine of the miraculous incarnation of the Son of God, quoting from "THINGS MOST SURELY BELIEVED," by Macartney (Cokesbury Press), Pp. 46 to 48.

"Those who look upon Jesus as just a great teacher, prophet, and example will not be troubled by the abandonment of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. But those who believe that Jesus came into the world to do the work that the New Testament tells us he came to do—that is, to save sinners,—'for this is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Jesus Christ came into this world to save sinners'—those who believe this, cannot abandon the Virgin Birth without abandoning their Lord and Redeemer. And why? Because in the Incarnation Christ assumed our nature. 'The Son of God became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul, and so was, and continues to be, both God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever.' It was this Person that became our Redeemer. By virtue of his divine

Sonship, absolute authority and infinite power belong to all that he spake and to all that he did for sinners on the cross. Yet it was only in his human nature that he was able to represent mankind and make satisfaction for the sin and guilt of the human race. As Dr. Charles Briggs once well put it: 'The man Jesus would be a prophet, a hero, a great exemplar, but not the Saviour of mankind. He might be the last and greatest of the heroes of faith, but not God Incarnate. Only a God-man who had taken human nature into organic union with himself and so identified himself with the human race as to become the common man, the head of the race, could redeem the race. The doctrine of the Virgin Birth gives us such a God-man. Natural generation could not possibly give us such a God-man. Therefore, the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is essential to the integrity of the Incarnation, as the Incarnation is to the doctrine of Christ and Christian salvation'."

Another purpose of the second Article of the Apostle's Creed is to emphasize *the vicarious sacrifice of Christ.* "Crucified, dead, and buried."

We get our deepest impression of Christ's divinity in his passion. The cross declares to all men the love of God in Christ, and the holiness of the Father as reflected in the Son. God's holiness condemns the sinner, but by the love of God he is saved. His redemption is brought about through the vicarious sacrifice of Him who, as the Son of God took upon Himself the sins of the world. This not only challenges our admiration, but also urges us to imitation. This evidently is one of the purposes intended by the framers of the Creed.

In that vicarious sacrifice of Jesus we also see a divine evaluation of the human soul, a divine estimate of human values. The faith of Jesus in the spiritual possibilities and permanence of human personality, his faith in the redeemability of mankind becomes fully apparent in his vicarious sacrifice. It shows how he valued men and women, not only for what they are, but for what they might become.

Is mankind not in need of this vicarious sacrifice today? Can we be saved by our own efforts, or need we not to rely fully on the merits of Christ's suffering and dying if we would have eternal salvation? There is no other way for twentieth century men and women to be saved.

The third purpose of Article II of our Creed is *to extend to us a challenge and an inspiration* to worthy service and purposeful destination. "Crucified, dead, and buried" would mean but little if embodied in the Creed only as events connected with the career of Christ, and in no relation to all mankind. It would be of little interest and sifinificance to our day and generation. "But that this

Christ, who revealed the Father and who made the sacrifice for human redemption can purify and energize our lives and set our feet in a path of worthy service and glorious destiny—this is the real thrill in the Christology of the Apostle's Creed. This is our need today. To have done with bickerings about Jesus and controversy concerning the details of his experience and to come to Him with such appreciation of spiritual necessities and realities that we allow His power and love and grace to transfigure our lives—this is our real task and the permanent service which these phrases of the Creed may now render us." ("What Is Left of the Apostles' Creed?" Edwards. Pp. 44-45. The Abingdon Press.)

If the second Article of the Apostolic Creed ended with the wordword "buried," if the power and influence of Christ ceased with the last breath on the cross, or His life-work came to a close when He was entombed in the grave of Joseph of Arimathea, alas!—we would be left in the predicament of the disciples of Emmaus—without hope. But the dawn of the first bright Easter morn brought the message, "He is risen," and now the risen Lord is the Hope of all the world. The belief in *the resurrection* of our Lord founded the Church, it gave us the Gospel, it brought on an era of progress, it is the very source of our twentieth century civilization, which never would have materialized but for the religion of the risen Lord.

We need give no proofs, we advance no arguments, and offer no apology for our belief in the truth proclaimed with unimpeachable authority: "The third day He rose again from the dead." We have no arguments to pit against the theories, that the resurrection of Christ is a lie or a hallucination, that He was not dead, but only in a trance. They are too crude, too absurd as to merit any consideration. "Only one theory accounts for the empty grave, and the conviction that Christ had risen, and that is the theory of the Gospels, of the Apostles, of the Church throughout the ages, that Christ rose again from the dead on the third day." (Macartney.) But we go a step farther and substitute for the word "theory," the term "fact." The Bible does not advance theories, it proclaims facts.

But what place shall we give the resurrection of Christ in our Christian life today? Should we not as Christians of this enlightened age set aside a belief which involves the supernatural and the miraculous? If Christ had not risen, what then? Let St. Paul give us the answer. "If Christ had not risen, then is our preaching vain; and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God. If Christ be not risen, your faith is vain. Ye are yet in your sins. Then they also who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this world only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." That the consequences for the Chris-

tian. And for the world?—if Christ were not risen the Church would have crumbled and collapsed long ago, and civilization would have been doomed. Men and women would have gone back to lust, cruelty and animalism, and the flame of hope died in every heart.

It is only logical that the risen Lord should *ascend* again to His God and Father in heaven, after His mission of redemption was fulfilled on earth. But to the Christians of all ages His ascension has become the hope of heaven after death, for He who ascended to heaven has promised to prepare for them a place in heaven, and has given them the assurance that He will come again in order to take them unto Himself in heaven. And from His throne on high the exalted Christ now rules the universe and governs His Church as the One to whom "all authority is given in heaven and on earth." The exalted Christ has become the inspirant of the believer's strongest hopes, the assurance of security when Satan accuses, and sin afflicts, for the great High-Priest, now seated at the right hand of the Father, intercedes for His own and makes secure for them the pardon for sin, which was the very purpose of His suffering and dying. (Hebrews 7: 25). And for the Church of today the exaltation of the risen Christ is still the mightiest incentive to preach the Gospel without fear and doubt, for as the eternal Prophet He continues to enlighten with wisdom and inspire men wtih love and courage to go forth into all the world and proclaim to all men eternal salvation through faith in His name.

Two more facts in the second Article of the Apostles' Creed need to be briefly considered. They are expressed in the phrases: "From thence He shall come—to judge the quick and the dead."

If Christ Himself had not so clearly announced to His disciples *His second coming,* and the writings of the New Testament did not so frequently mention it, we could scarcely speak of this tenet of our Christian faith as founded on a fact. But even though this fact may lie in the more or less distant future, we accept it upon overwhelming evidence. To deny it would be making Christ a liar. Though twentieth century Christians may be puzzled as to the nearness of this event, even as the early Christians were continually speculating concerning it, they would have no ground and no right to treat this doctrine with disdain. But what is the practical significance of this doctrine? It is one of hope and inspiration for the Church. Without the shadow of a doubt we know that Christ's Kingdom shall come, and that He shall have dominion over all forever; that the Holy City of God shall come down, and take the place of this sinful world, with its sorrow and shame, its suffering and death, and the whole earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord.

And for the individual Christian this teaching of Christ and His Apostles is such that it inspires and purifies his life, teaching ever to live as in the presence of Christ, and to watch and pray. "Every one that has this hope purifieth himself." The event, though linked with no calendar date, is none the less certain. Therefore it behooves every truly believing Christian to heed the warning of Him who shall come again to judge the quick and the dead: "Take heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is." (Mark 13: 33).

Christ shall come again *"to judge the quick and the dead."* Christ is the Judge, none other. He is eminently qualified because He was tempted in all things as we are. He knows human nature. "He knew what was in a man." It is consolation for trembling sinners to know they shall stand before one who is the "Friend of sinners."

On the other hand it is a solemn thought that Christ is to be our Judge. He who for our sake once stood condemned before Pilate shall one day sit in the seat of universal judgment. His sentence will be one of perfect justice and yet one of perfect mercy. There can be no doubt as to the righteousness of His judgment, no gainsaying of His infallible verdict.

In anticipation of this righteous judgment of Him who is the infallible Judge, we shall need to be prepared to stand before Him, heed His words of warning, live in accordance with His teachings, avoid all that is contrary to His will. How the thought of the Judgment should influence our every thought and act, control all our passions, and govern our practical life as Christians in this world! If this doctrine is truly believed, it can have but one result: a life that is carefully guarded against all unholy thoughts, words and deeds, producing fruits of righteousness that shall stand the test of His solemn scrutiny.

III.

The third Article of the Apostles' Creed introduces *the doctrines of the Church concerning the Holy Spirit.* He is placed side by side with the Father and the Son. He is the third person of the Holy Trinity, not because of inferior rank or less importance, but merely numerically. Concerning the Holy Spirit less is known, and less has been said and written, than concerning the other persons of the Holy Trinity. Perhaps there are Christians today, who like the twelve men who had received the baptism of John, had "not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Spirit."

Yet He is a Reality through whose presence God is in the world, and through whom the redemptive work of Jesus is continued in this world, and the possibility given for all men to enter

the Kingdom of God, and to avail themselves of the salvation wrought by the Saviour of mankind.

The Holy Spirit is no less divine, than Christ, the Son. He is God. All the attributes of God are His also. Like God, the Father, He is ever present. In the beginning, when the earth was waste and void, He hovered over the surface of the waters. When Christ had received the baptism of John, the Spirit of God descended upon Him in the form of a dove. When Christ had ascended into heaven He caused the Father to send the Holy Spirit upon His disciples, and in the power and enlightenment of that Spirit twelve insignificant and uneducated men from the ranks of the common people went forth to conquer the world for their Heavenly King. No event in the Kingdom of God transpired without the presence of the Holy Spirit. No success in the work of Christianizing the world can be achieved without Him.

He is the *Spirit of Power,* in whose strength the weak may accomplish great things, which otherwise are impossible to the strong and mighty; He is the *Spirit of Wisdom* by whom the ignorant are taught the things that are essential to their soul's salvation; He is the *Spirit of Holiness* who sanctifies sinners, guides and directs them, and impels them to do that which is good.

All these statements concerning the Holy Spirit are not only tenets of faith, or merely speculative theories, but facts, experienced by many thousands, yet, millions of believers. What true believer has not observed the influence of the Spirit of God upon mankind, His presence and work in the ranks of the Church? What child of God has not experienced His influence and assistance? His power and wisdom? How real does the Spirit of God appear to us in our spiritual experiences! How we feel His breath upon us, when we stand in the presence of God on sacred occasions of our lives, or in the life of the Church, which through Him is a Communion of Saints!

Above all, *the Spirit is our Comforter* in the sorrows of life, when all seems dark and comfortless. His presence, His comfort, fill us with true optimism, when all around us is doubt and gloom, fear and unrest, dreadful suspense and bitter disappointment. Truly, without the Holy Spirit we would be groping in the dark, lost in sin, steeped in despair. That is the significance of the brief confession: "I believe in the Holy Spirit."

Does Christianity in the twentieth century need this Spirit? It is superfluous to ask this question. Without the Holy Spirit we cannot think of the Church as a mighty institution, wielding her wholesome influence over the lives of men and women, leading them onward and upward to the higher and highest principles and ideals of the Kingdom of God.

The *One, Holy, Universal, Christian Church* cannot exist, indeed, would not exist, without the Holy Spirit. Her blessings would not be shed abroad in every land and nation, but for this Lord and Distributor of all gifts. There would have been no increase from a handful of believers to a thousand million adherents of the Christian faith. The Church would not have been instrumental in bringing about a civilization, such as this twentieth century can boast, without the influence of the Spirit of God, enlightening the world. The splendid institutions of charity and mercy throughout all Christendom would not have sprung into existence, without the love that emanates from the Spirit of God who is Love.

The Church of Jesus Christ, though divided into many communions, yet is *one,* because one Spirit is at work within her. There would be no holiness, scarce as it seems to be in the Church today, were not the Spirit of God at work in the hearts of her members, cleansing them from sin, and sanctifying them by His grace. The Spirit of God is at work in the Church today with the means of grace, the Word of God and the Sacraments, though the results may not always come under observation. "The wind bloweth where it will etc." (John 3: 8). These words of Jesus apply here.

Without the Spirit of God the Church cannot become *a universal Church,* for the Holy Spirit is the motive power that constantly impels the progress of the Church, inspires her to every effort in behalf of the Kingdom, fills her with love for sinners, removes every barrier to world evangelization.

Through the Holy Spirit the Church universal will not only become a reality, but it will develop into a *"Communion of Saints,"* where love will become the only motive of mutual service and helpfulness. Thus the Christian Church shall truly become the *Body of Christ,* of which He is the Exalted Head, and all the members firmly united with Him, and with each other. In such a Church sinners will find a haven of rest, a refuge from the persecution of Satan, for through the Spirit of God, Forgiveness of Sins, full pardon and grace is assured to every truly penitent child of God.

To all such is held out the glorious prospect of the *"Resurrection of the Body and the Life Everlasting."* Of all the doctrines in the Creed the resurrection of the body is most difficult to believe. "Impossible," some would say in a tone of finality. But to Him who has given life to our bodies at the time of birth, it is possible to quicken the dust and the ashes of our dead bodies, and to endow them with a better and greater life in eternity.

With the last phrase of the Apostles' Creed: "Life Everlasting." "we have come to the crown of the Creed. The last is here for which the first was made. The Almighty Father not only was, but

is, and ever shall be. Jesus, the Christ not merely lived and died, but is to be our Saviour through the eternal years. The Holy Spirit not merely brought the truth to our remembrance, but will comfort us through the ages. The Church not only sweeps in conquering sway through the Christian centuries, but is the bride of Christ to stand before His throne 'without spot or wrinkle or any such thing.' The communion of saints is not only a fellowship for time, but a fellowship for eternity. The forgiveness of sins is not a transient mood nor a temporizing act, but an abiding experience whose caressing and crowning wonder will last throughout the revolving years."

"Life is to go on. It is to be everlasting, and we echo our faith in this historic statement of Christian experience, of Christian hope, and of Christian certitude, which not only comforts us now, but will be our continuing comfort 'when the sun grows cold and the stars are old and the leaves of the Judgment Book unfold'." ("What Is Left of the Apostles' Creed?" Macartney.)

"THE LORD'S PRAYER"

Paul O. David

Volumes have been written about this prayer. There is still room for more treatises, for old and new interpretations and for a more general revival of interest in this old and familiar prayer. A renewed study thereof by the members of the church may be the means to foster a more general appreciation and lead to a more thorough grasp and understanding of its beauty, its spirit and its verity. Furthermore the followers of the Master in every age need to make a more wholehearted attempt to apply its principles—like the gospel message—not only to the realm of private and public devotion, but also to social life as a whole.

All the gold has not yet been taken from this deep mine; precious nuggets and valuable treasures may still be found therein. This prayer is and ever will be a treasury of wealth to every minister as well as a source of blessing and spiritual enrichment to devout and seeking souls throughout the ages.

A study of the subject of prayer as a whole or any part thereof ought to be of more than passing interest. Prayer is one of the main avenues of approach to God and refers to an element of sustenance which is essential to the spiritual welfare of man.

The Bible is a book of prayers; it may be termed the prayer-book of God's people. A study of the prayers on record in Holy Writ, therefore, should be of special interest. Valuable lessons are taught in the prayers of all the saints throughout the ages during both the Old and the New dispensation.

The prayers of the Lord are of especial interest and moment; they warrant a special study and treatise. The prayers of the Lord are remarkable as to spirit, scope and comprehensiveness. We are prompted to ask: "What manner of prayers are these?" The statement concerning the personality of Christ: "Who can tell the unsearchable riches of Christ," aptly applies to the prayers of the Lord.

We pass by these matchless prayers of the Lord and direct our attention to the prayer universally called: "The Lord's Prayer."

In an article limited to a given number of pages reference can only be made to a few salient and noteworthy features of this cherished prayer.

We possess two gospel records of the Lord's Prayer. Matthew presents the one stressing the manner in which men ought to pray, Matt. 6: 5-13. Luke has the other as an answer to a disciple's request: "Lord, teach us to pray as John taught his disciples. Luke 11: 1-4. The two versions are not alike. Matthew has the most

complete version. Both versions do not contain the doxology as found in general use today. Luke's version is remarkable for it omits other parts of the prayer which are found in Matthew. At least this is the opinion of scholars who base their evidence and conclusions on some of the oldest manuscripts available. Luke's version then is as follows: "Father, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive everyone indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation." Luke thus omits a part of the invocation, the third and seventh petitions as well as the doxology.

In Schaff-Lange's commentary we find this comment concerning these omissions. "If these clauses were originally missing in Luke they might have been supplied afterwards from Matthew and inserted in a number of manuscripts to attain a uniformity of the Lord's Prayer. On the other hand if all parts were originally in Luke no motive can be assigned for these omissions."

Matthew introduces the Lord's Prayer as a part of the Sermon on the Mount; Luke under different circumstances although he does not specify time and place. The Mount of Olives is traditionally pointed out as the place where the prayer was given. There is nothing in the content to warrant this opinion. "Matthew does not give the Lord's Prayer in the Sermon on the Mount because it was uttered there for the first time, but because the Master's instruction concerning prayer offered the occasion to insert it at that place." Luke attaches the account to the domestic scene in the home of Mary and Martha. Whether the prayer was given once or twice is a matter of dispute among scholars; a solution satisfactory and acceptable to all probably will never be found. The questions involved are not so important. We have the prayer; when it was given, whether once or twice, in full or in abbreviated form according to the needs of the occasion is a matter of minor importance.

Closely related with the text of the Lord's Prayer according to Matthew is the prayer found in the Didache, i.e., the Teachings of the Twelve Apostles, 8: 2: "Do not pray as the hypocrites do, but as the Lord commanded in his Gospel, so pray ye;" and then follows Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer as well as a part of the doxology: "For thine is the power and the glory forever."

The prayer has also been called, "The Disciples' Prayer," since it was given primarily for the benefit of disciples. The majority of Christians, however, prefer the universally accepted term designating the Lord's authorship.

As we contemplate the prayer as a whole it is impossible to conceive that Jesus made use of some parts of the prayer as repre-

senting his own needs and wants. When addressing God in behalf of his followers Jesus used the expression, "Our Father," thus identifying himself with the cause of humanity; but when he speaks to God concerning himself he invariably says, "Father," or, "My Father"; otherwise he differentiates ihmself and uses the term, "Your Father." We, the disciples of the Master, are to use this prayer and pray after this manner, and thus give expression of our devotion to the honor and glory of God as well as make known our human needs and wants.

"The Lord's Prayer" enjoys a unique distinction and relative prominence among the prayers on record in the Bible. It occupies, as it were, a central position among the prayers of the Old and the New dispensation; it is the herald of a new order and a new spirit of prayer. A change from the old unto the new had also come to pass in matters of prayers. Jesus gave to his followers a new prayer, although he may have embodied ideas from prayers in use at the time or even incorporated old material and well known phrases into the new prayer. It was a new creation, nevertheless, furnishing an apt illustration of the general truth expressed in the statement: "Behold, I make all things new."

Concerning the origin of "The Lord's Prayer" we are referred to the context of Matthew's and Luke's gospel. No doubt the disciples were deeply impressed by the Master's manner and spirit voiced in prayer. As a result of the habits of continuous prayer Jesus revealed in his attitude and countenance and personality visible marks of his intimate intercourse with God. Therefore, the disciples expressed a desire to have access to this divine fount of blessings, and they ask for the privilege to be led into a similar intimate fellowship with God. "Lord, teach us to pray," is their request. In response Jesus gave to them this "Pearl of Prayers."

According to Matthew the disciples were cautioned to be on their guard against the spirit of display and ostentation during prayer. Men prayed "to be seen of men" and "used vain repetitions." The significance of these statements will appear when we recall some of the customs and practices of prayer prevalent among Jews and Gentiles. Long prayers were in common use and Rabbis could often be seen in an attitude of prayer for hours at a time. In their liturgies they repeated over and over again the same petitions in slightly altered form; the common opinion prevailed: "Whosoever multiplies prayer is certain of a hearing." Similar practices still exist among Mohammedans. The rules for daily prayer are prescribed in minutest detail. Five daily prayers must be uttered at the appointed time wherever the devotee may be, in the mosque, the market-place, on the street or at home. Each prayer must be repeated a prescribed number of times and in the prescribed

posture; any deviation in the slightest particular makes the prayer void in effect and it must be repeated again.

In view of the general perversion of the idea of prayer Jesus instructed his followers to shun the tendency of display, to avoid vain repetitions, long meaningless prayers and be concise passing on from one idea to another always conscious of the fact, "Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him."

"Be not ye, therefore, like unto them, for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking." "After this manner, therefore, pray ye," and then he gave to the world this model prayer.

As to spirit, form, brevity and comprehensiveness it is a perfect model of prayer. Dr. Miller in his book, "The Golden Gate of Prayer," comments on it in this wise. "The Lord's Prayer is short, but every word of it is laden with precious meaning. In its few petitions it covers the whole field of prayer. It is easy to repeat its sentences, for we have been saying them from infancy; but it is hard to say it through as a real prayer, for it means the consecration of our whole life to God, and the submission of will, affections and service to him."

Perhaps no part of the Scriptures is so well known as is this prayer. Its words are familiar throughout Christendom and the world in general. "Happy would it be for the world, if this prayer were so well known in the spirit as it is in the letter." It is a most precious treasure and one of the most cherished possessions of mankind. "Familiarity has dulled our sense of its beauty, simplicity and spirituality; there are in this familiar prayer heights we have never scaled and depths we have never sounded."

The prayer surely was not intended as a mere formula, but rather as a general pattern and guide for all our private and public devotions. The theory has been advanced that it was given as a set form of prayer to take the place of forms of prayers then in vogue among the Jews. Dr. Wordsworth so regards it. "Our Lord here by this prayer authorizes forms of prayer, and delivers a particular form to be used and to serve as a pattern for the subject and order of our desires and prayers, and, therefore, as a guide for our practice." Dr. Alfred holds the opposite view. "It is very improbable that the prayer was regarded in the very earliest times as a set form delivered for liturgical use by our Lord. We find very few traces of such use in early times." Theologians differ in their views and advance reasons pro and contra to support their propositions, whereas not a few maintain that both views contain a degree of truth. This matchless prayer was undoubtedly given both as a form to be rightly used and as a model for all other prayers. It should, however, be used as an expression of our real desires and sincere devotion.

The early Church Fathers treated it not only as a pattern or a model prayer, but also as a form to be used in the very words of Jesus. There is no indication that it was ever used as a form by Jesus or even by the Apostles. It first appears as a part of a ritual in the third century being used in the services of the church. The Church Fathers call it the prayer taught by God upon which all other prayers are to be founded. Augustine states that the catechumens were taught this prayer at baptism in this manner: "Receive now this precious jewel and keep it; receive the prayer which the Lord himself has taught us to bring before God." The Reformers also speak of it in terms of highest praise. Luther especially refers to it with warmth and enthusiasm. A quotation from Dr. Gibson in the Expositor's Bible reads: "Jesus hands us this "Pearl of great Price," this purest crystal of devotion, to be a possession of his people forever, never to lose its luster through millenniums of daily use, its beauty and preciousnes becoming rather more and more manifest to each successive generation."

Because of the prevalent misuse of this prayer Luther styled it the "greatest martyr." The Lord's Prayer has often been lowered to the level of an empty formula; in meaningless fashion it was oft repeated without devotion and profit. Then again it has been a real source of comfort and blessing to an innumerable host who uttered these words as a real prayer. The misuse by means of vain repetitions probably has led others to the opposite extreme of neglect and non-use of this perfect model of prayer.

In this connection reference may be made to a popular misconception concerning the correct or best mode of prayer. A memorized prayer like the Lord's Prayer or those read from a prayer-book are usually classed as being of doubtful or inferior value, whereas the spontaneously spoken or extemporaneous prayer is considered to be the better mode of prayer and is commonly thought to proceed from the heart. Certainly there is no one mode of prayer in itself correct and all others wrong or inferior. How much of what we say spontaneously and extemporaneously, with or without special premeditation may after all be mere rote and formalism, a sort of memoriter and meaningless mode of prayer; it may often be classed as mere lip-worship, whereas the heart is far removed from prayerful communion with God. The one thing needful is that our prayers whether memorized, real or spoken at the impulse of the moment, or premeditated express our real desires and sincere devotion. The divine answer to prayer will then be forthcoming regardless of what mode of prayer may be used. It surely is proper to use the very words of the Lord's Prayer. "It would be unwise and ungrateful not to use words so perfect and beautiful, consecrated by the lips of the Lord and endeared by the experience of

blessings of tens of thousands." It is not necessary to use this prayer always, but we ought always to pray after the manner and spirit of the Lord's Prayer.

The Lord's Prayer is generally divided into three main parts, the invocation, the petitions and the doxology. The petitions are divided into two sections. The first three petitions refer to the honor and glory of God and contain desires and requests concerning the name, the kingdom and the will of God. The petitions of the second division express the needs and wants of man concerning daily sustenance, forgiveness of sins, protection during temptation and deliverance from evil.

The twofold division has a parallel in the ten commandments and the summary of law. Things that concern God rank first in precedence both in the Law and in the Lord's Prayer.

What a dark picture of human conditions lies beneath the petitions of the second half of the Lord's Prayer, hunger, sin, temptation and all that is included in that tragic word—evil. What sorrows and misery these terms presuppose! Each petition seems to carry us deeper into the shadows as each refers to a darker aspect of life. The last petition contains a plea for deliverance from every ill that human life is heir to. "Deliver us from evil." That is a request for the entire emancipation of the human race and a plea for the utter extinction of evil in its effect upon men. Yet, the Lord's Prayer contains the plea and voices the desire of mankind for complete deliverance from evil and the Evil One, for the realization of the divine plan of redemption and the final establishment of the Kingdom of God. Complete deliverance from evil is the goal of our faith and hope and prayer. Nothing less can satisfy our deepest yearnings; nothing less can lead to the realization of the divine plan as revealed in Christ for mankind. Jesus would have our souls reach out in noble aspirations on the wings of prayer and then through a wholehearted dedication and consecration of our lives to these ideals and principles seek to realize the aims and purposes and objectives enumerated in this most cherished prayer.

The doxology undoubtedly formed no part of the original prayer and is commonly regarded as an addition made for liturgical purposes. It is not found in the oldest manuscripts in existence today. Although it does occur at an early date in some manuscripts. Nevertheless these closing words voice a spirit and a trend of thought wholly in accord with the prayer.

We may use this prayer as a formula in the very words of the Lord or as a model and general pattern to express our personal desires for the glorification of God and the satisfying of the needs of man in words of our own making. But whatever use may be

made of this prayer it is essential that we pray after the manner of it. Thus used the Lord's Prayer shall continue to be a source of blessing and inspiration and power in our lives both during our private and public devotions.

Jesus taught men to pray in this manner. The Lord's Prayer is indeed "The Golden Gate of Prayer," for it covers the whole field of God's will and man's temporal and eternal needs; it voices all that pertains to the honor of God and expresses every essential need of man.

Die Betätigung des christlichen Charakters in der Kulturgemeinschaft von Wissenschaft und Kunst

Von Prof. Dr. Grützmacher.

Der Begriff der Kultur steht der Natur gegenüber und umschließt alles das, was durch menschliche Tätigkeit zustande gekommen ist. Gebiet der menschlichen Tätigkeit ist sowohl die eigene geist-leibliche Persönlichkeit, wie die gesamte außerhalb unsrer bestehende Wirklichkeit. Einen kultivierten Menschen nennt man denjenigen, der sein eigenes Wesen umgestaltet, seinen Leib gepflegt, seine Seele gebildet hat. Von dieser Kultivierung der eigenen Persönlichkeit durch das Christentum war schon die Rede. In der objektiven Welt denkt man zunächst an die Kultivierung des Landes; kommt doch der Ausdruck Kultur von „cultura agri," Kultur ist danach eine wirtschaftliche Tätigkeit die, besonders in der neueren Zeit eng mit dem politischen Leben zusammenhängt. Von der kulturellen Wirtschafts- und Staatsethik wird in den nächsten Aufsätzen zu handeln sein. Kultur im höchsten Sinn ist jedoch die geistige Betätigung des Menschen, die entsprechende Güter hervorruft. An der Spitze eines großen modernen Sammelwerks: „Die Kultur der Gegenwart" steht darum die Definition: „Die Kultur ist die Erhebung des Menschen über den Naturzustand durch die Ausbildung und Betätigung seiner geistigen und sittlichen Kräfte." Die geistigen Kräfte des Menschen schlagen gegenüber der Wirklichkeit einen doppelten Weg ein; entweder nehmen sie die Dinge erkennend in den menschlichen Geist hinein oder sie tragen diesen umbildend in jene hinüber. Die erste Tätigkeit ist die Wurzel aller Wissenschaft, die zweite aller Kunst. **Kultur im engeren Sinn bedeutet darum Wissenschaft und Kunst** und unsre Aufgabe ist es die Betätigung des christlichen Charakters in diesen beiden Gemeinschaften zu schildern.

Wissenschaft und Kunst scheinen allerdings zunächst mehr in die Sphäre des individuellen, als des sozialen Lebens zu fallen. Der wissenschaftliche Arbeiter will mit eigenen Augen die Wahrheit erkennen, und der Zweifel an aller überkommenen Tradition erscheint ihm als Pflicht. Echte Wissenschaft arbeitet auch unbekümmert um die sozialen Folgen ihrer Ergebnisse. Hält sie bestimmte Rechtsformen oder Heilmethoden für falsch, so spricht sie das unbekümmert um die Konsequenzen für das politische Leben oder die übliche Volkshygiene aus. In der Wissenschaft gibt es stets eine Fülle individueller Meinungen und einander befehdender Richtungen. Infolgedessen stellt die Wissenschaft eine Größe dar, welche Gemeinschaft mehr stört als bildet. Aber diese Züge treffen nur eine Seite der

empirischen Wissenschaft. In ihrer idealen Wesenheit ist das soziale Element deutlich angelegt und macht sich auch in der Wirklichkeit geltend. Kein wissenschaftlicher Forscher fängt von vorne an, überall knüpft er — wenn auch kritisch — an die Resultate der Vorgänger und Mitarbeit an. Das Nein einer Generation ist oft nichts anders als das umgekehrte Ja der vorangehenden. Aber auch jedes echt wissenschaftliche Ergebnis geht in das Gemeinschaftsleben über und fördert dieses. Copernikus hat für die ganze moderne Welt beobachtet und gedacht; Columbus hat einen neuen Erdteil zum besten zahlreicher Millionen entdeckt. Auch die hauptsächlichsten Formen, deren sich die Wissenschaft bedient, sind sozialer Art: Wort und Schrift. Beide sind die Erscheinungsformen der Sprache und die Sprache ist das Urelement welches geistig-soziale Gemeinschaft schafft. Mit der Erlernung einer oder gar mehrerer Sprachen nimmt der Einzelne eine Unsumme geistigen Erbgutes auf, und indem er diese Formen mit individuellem seelischem Eigenleben erfüllt, arbeitet er auch seinerseits an der kulturellen Verbindung der Menschen. Die Wissenschaft ruft auch besondre Organisationsformen hervor. Der Autodidakt und der Privatgelehrte sind nur Ausnahmeerscheinungen; normalerweise wird alle wissenschaftliche Bildung in besonderen Gemeinschaften empfangen und fortgesetzt, durch Schulen aller Art von den einfachsten über die Mittel- zu den Hochschulen. Die Gelehrten finden sich in Akademien und in Universitäten zusammen, deren Name ursprünglich nicht auf die Universalität der Wissenschaften, sondern auf die Gemeinschaft der Lehrenden und Lernenden sich bezog.

So ist die Wissenschaft als subjektiver Trieb, wie als objektive Schöpfung eine den Individualismus mit der sozialen Gemeinschaft verbindende Größe. Damit trägt sie im allgemeinen Sinn sittlichen Charakter, wie es die schon einmal herangezogene Einleitung in die „Kultur der Gegenwart" feststellt. „Die sittliche Kultur ist die Bedingung für den dauernden Bestand der Kultur überhaupt. Sie fordert die freie Unterwerfung des Willens unter ein höheres Gesetz in den Beziehungen der Einzelnen sowohl untereinander als in Staat und Gesellschaft." Der sittliche Charakter des Menschen ist Voraussetzung der Wissenschaft, wie er umgekehrt durch sie gefördert wird. Unsre spezielle Frage aber ist es, ob auch der christliche Charakter sich wissenschaftlich betätigen darf und in welcher Weise er sein Christentum in der Wissenschaft geltend zu machen hat. Es gibt Weltanschauungen, welche zur Wissenschaft nur ein negatives Verhältnis haben. Für den Buddhismus ist auch der Trieb nach Erkenntnis unsrer Wirklichkeit so wertlos, wie jede andre innerweltliche Betätigung. Aber auch im Abendland haben pessimistische Einstellungen wie die Schopenhauers – trotz eigener wissenschaftlicher Betätigung — das Erkennen als eine Gefahr des Wollens be-

zeichnet. Rousseau sah in der Wissenschaft eine Störung für die unmittelbare Naturverbundenheit des Menschen. Gerade in der Gegenwart ist eine antiwissenschaftliche Haltung sehr verbreitet. **Geht man in das Urchristentum zurück so findet man bei Jesus selbst keine direkte Stellungnahme zur Wissenschaft, aber ebensowenig ihre Verwerfung.** Jesu Aufgabe war nur das Eine zu betonen, was Not ist, die Gewinnung der Seele in Gottes Reich. Aber aus seinen Gleichnissen spricht eine klare, wenn auch schlichte Beobachtung der irdischen Wirklichkeit, in welcher die Grundlage auch aller wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnis liegt. Unter den Aposteln haben sich Johannes und erst recht Paulus durchaus wissenschaftlicher Methoden bedient und gerade des Letzteren Warnung vor Philosophie und loser Lehre beweist seine Vertrautheit mit ihr und begrenzt ihre Ablehnung auf den Fall, daß sie von Christus wegführt. **Das Neue Testament lehnt die Wissenschaft nur dann ab, wenn sie eine Konkurrenz und ein Ersatz für die Religion sein will,** läßt aber im übrigen dem christlichen Charakter eine Beteiligung an ihr durchaus frei. Die Kirche ist von den Tagen der Apologeten an in Verbindung mit wissenschaftlichem Denken getreten; die mittelalterliche Scholastik hat sich sogar um eine große Synthese der Philosophie mit der christlichen Offenbarung bemüht. Nachdem dieses Unterfangen gescheitert war, hat die Reformation, die aus Wort und Glauben erwachsene religiöse Erkenntnis und die aus natürlicher Erfahrung und deren vernünftiger Verarbeitung entstehende Wissenschaft strenger unterschieden. **Gerade aber durch die Reformation ist die Entwicklung einer selbständigen innerweltlichen Wissenschaft möglich geworden.** Luther spricht seine prinzipielle Stellung zur wissenschaftlichen Kultur, wenn auch in sehr schlichten Beispielen in dem Satz aus: „Die Vernunft und die Erfahrung lehren, wie man Weib und Kinder regiere, Kühe aus- und eintreiben solle. Dies alles ist der Vernunft Gabe und Geschenk, ihr von Gott mitgeteilt und verliehen; davon darf man nicht die heilige Schrift um Rat fragen, sondern Gott hat auch allen Heiden solche Gaben gegeben." Der Neuprotestantismus eines Schleiermacher, Rothe und Tröltsch hat das Verhältnis von Offenbarung und Vernunft, Christentum und Kultur wieder ganz eng gestaltet, aber so, daß das Christentum zur Dienerin der Kultur wurde. Es hat die Hemmungen im Kulturprozeß zu beseitigen und diesen zu seiner letzten Vollendung zu führen. Dem gegenüber ist in der neusten Theologie eine radikale Reaktion erwacht, welche Christentum und Kultur, Theologie und Wissenschaft nicht nur scheidet, sondern in unversöhnliche Gegnerschaft bringt. Wer aber an einen Schöpfungsgott glaubt und von ihm den wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnistrieb dem menschlichen Geist eingestiftet sein läßt, wird auch als Christ dessen Betätigung nicht verachten, ja nicht nur dulden,

sondern nach dem Maß seiner Kräfte produktiv und rezeptiv fördern. Gott will, daß die Menschen zur Erkenntnis der Wahrheit auch hinsichtlich der uns umgebenden Wirklichkeit kommen. **So kann sich auch ein christlicher Charakter die Wissenschaft als Lebensberuf wählen, und gerade er wird geeignet sein, die religiösen und ethischen Gefahren der Wissenschaft zu meiden.** Immer wieder liegt dieser die Neigung nahe, auf Grund ihrer innerweltlichen Erkenntnisse auch die Lösung der letzten Fragen vornehmen zu wollen. Die Naturwissenschaft hat im 19. Jahrhundert versucht in der Form des Monismus sämtliche Welträtsel zu beantworten, und die Philosophie versuchte, selbst in das innere Leben Gottes einzudringen. Dem gegenüber hat der Christ die Wissenschaft an ihre Grenzen zu erinnern, und wenn er an ihr mitarbeitet und etwas leistet, wird sein Wort mehr in die Wagschale fallen, als wenn schlichte Christen allgemeine Warnungen vor der Wissenschaft erlassen. Jede Gefährdung des Glaubens erwächst niemals aus dem Wesen der Wissenschaft, sondern nur aus unzulässigen und darum unethischen Grenzüberschreitungen. Aber auch subjektiv schließt der wissenschaftliche Betrieb Versuchungen in sich. Er erzeugt vielfach maßloses Selbstbewußtsein, ungeheure Eitelkeit und damit verbunden Streitigkeiten, deren Gehässigkeit durchaus unethisch ist. Auch hier kann gerade ein christlicher Charakter reinigend wirken. Er ist von vornherein gegen eine Ueberschätzung wissenschaftlicher Entdeckungen gesichert, die niemals die letzten Geheimnisse der Welt entschleiern können. Er wird aber auch die Leistung der andern nicht schmälern und auch in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion die Forderung gegenseitiger Achtung, ja Liebe nicht außer acht lassen.

Wie wir den Begriff der Wissenschaft wesentlich als einen gegebenen und allgemein verständlichen annehmen mußten, so gilt das recht gegenüber der **Kunst,** weil deren scharfe Definition so verschieden vollzogen wird, während sich dem gesunden Menschenverstand und unmittelbaren Gefühl die Eigenart dieses Gebietes leichter entschleiert. War die Wissenschaft diejenige Funktion, durch welche der Mensch die Welt der Erscheinungen erkennend in sein Inneres hineinnimmt, **so ist die Kunst die produktive Tätigkeit, durch welche geistige Inhalte zu sinnlicher Erscheinung kommen oder sinnliche Erscheinungen zu Trägern geistigen Erlebens werden.** Schöpfungen der Phantasie werden verleiblicht in Wort und Ton, in Farbe und Stein; Naturvorgänge empfangen einen vergeistigten Gehalt. Es gibt keine Kunst ohne ein sinnliches Element, aber auch nichts Reales in ihr, das nicht mit idealen Momenten verknüpft ist. Man kann darum sowohl mit Zola sagen: „Kunst ist Natur, durch ein Temperament gesehen," wie mit Volkmann: „Kunst ist Natur, vom Menschengeist geboren." Der Unterschied zwischen einer sogenannten idealistischen und einer realistischen Kunst ist immer nur ein

relativer und gradueller. Die produktive Mischung und Ineinsbildung von Idealem und Realem macht das Wesen der Kunst aus, dessen richtiges Verständnis für ihre ethische Bewertung von großer Bedeutung ist. **Die erste Gabe, welche die richtig verstandene protestantische Ethik der Kunst bringt ist die entschiedene Anerkennung ihrer Selbständigkeit und ihres Eigenwertes.** Gehört es zu den Naturtrieben des Menschen, sich in dem geschilderten Sinn künstlerisch zu betätigen, so ist damit das sittliche Recht für jeden Menschen gegeben. Es wäre eine Versündigung gegen den Schöpfer — Gott, wenn die Menschheit nicht das Schöne schaffen wollte. Dementsprechend haben schon die Menschen in uralter Zeit ihre Höhlen und ihre Körper mit primitiver Kunst geziert, im Fortgang der Entwicklung ist die Kunst immer mehr zur höchsten geistigen Lebensäußerung menschlicher Kultur geworden. Auch der religiöse Mensch und der christliche Charakter, dem Gott auch der große Künstler ist, der die Fülle seiner Ideen in die Stofflichkeit dieser Welt hineingebildet und dadurch so viel Schönes geschaffen hat, empfindet das Recht, ja die Pflicht, künstlerisch zu schaffen oder nachzuempfinden. Gegenüber der näheren Ausgestaltung der Kunst hat die christliche Ethik die stärkste Zurückhaltung auszuüben. Man hat behauptet, daß der reformatorische Protestantismus nicht entfernt solche Kunstfreundlichkeit wie der Katholizismus bezeugt, und darum viel weniger Kunstwerke hervorgerufen habe. Aber abgesehn auch davon, daß die Einwirkungen eines religiösen Prinzips durchaus nicht im ersten Augenblick schon einzustellen brauchen und der Protestantismus später, wenn auch in andern Künsten, wie in der Musik, erhebliche Leistungen aufzuweisen hat, ist die Entstehung einer selbständigen innerweltlichen Kunst eine der wichtigsten Absichten und darum auch Erfolge des Protestantismus. Die Kunst soll sich nach ihren eigenen Gesetzen entwickeln. Steht es aber so, dann kann vom Standort des christlichen Charakters keine sittliche Wertabstufung zwischen den einzelnen Kunstgattungen vollzogen werden, etwa die Musik höher als die Plastik gestellt werden. Noch weniger aber ist ein Anlaß, vom ethischen Standort aus bestimmte Stile wie etwa den gothischen gegenüber dem klassischen den Vorzug zu geben. Auch hinsichtlich des Stoffes ist der Kunst völlig freie Wahl zu lassen, ja die Ethik hat nicht einmal zu fordern, daß ein Roman nur ideale Erscheinungen schildere, oder jedes Drama mit dem Sieg des Guten ende. Auch die Wiedergabe des nackten menschlichen Körpers ist der Kunst im Prinzip von der Ethik nicht zu verbieten. Denn gehört zur gottgeschaffenen Wirklichkeit auch der unbekleidete Leib, herrscht in der Welt ebenso das Gute wie das Böse und siegt das letztere nicht selten, so ist die Darstellung dieser Tatbestände auch das Recht der Kunst. Wäre es anders, so dürfte auch die Kunst nicht, worauf eine neuere Schrift mit Recht hinweist, die

Kreuzigung Jesu darstellen denn diese ist die unmoralischste Handlung in der Weltgeschichte gewesen. Gerade die größten Dichter wie Shakespeare haben eine Fülle schlechter Menschen und abscheulicher Handlungen dargestellt. **Steht es aber so, daß der christliche Charakter der Kunst die Wahl ihrer Formen und ihres Stoffes, selbst, wenn dieser objektiv unmoralisch ist, freilassen muß, so scheint damit die Kunst jeder christlich sittlichen Beeinflussung entnommen zu sein, die Kunst in der Tat, aber nicht der Künstler und nicht der Kunstgenießende.** Der Satz: „Die Kunst nur für die Kunst" ist so weit und so lange richtig, als er sich auf die objektive künstlerische Leistung bezieht, er wird aber unrichtig, wenn er den schaffenden Künstler und den Kunstfreund als Persönlichkeiten moralischer Beurteilung entziehen will. War die Behauptung richtig, daß in jedem Kunstwerk ein subjektives Element steckt und zwar um so stärker, je bedeutender der Künstler ist, so wird durch dessen moralische oder unmoralische Persönlichkeit das Kunstwerk weitgehend beeinflußt. Der Dichter, der Menschheitstragödien schafft, muß selbst zu ihnen irgendeine persönliche und damit ethische Stellung einnehmen. Hier ist der Einsatzpunkt für die Ethik. Denn bei allem Verständnis für das besondre Temperament und die eigentümlichen Schwierigkeiten einer künstlerischen Natur wird auch von ihr ein Ethos verlangt werden, das sich entsprechend in dem Werk geltend macht. Allein für die tatsächliche Wirkung eines Kunstwerkes ist nicht nur der Charakter des Schaffenden, sondern mindestens im gleichen Maß der des Genießenden von Bedeutung. Der Kunstgenießende hat sich zu prüfen, ob er die sittliche Reife besitzt, jeden Roman zu lesen und jedes Stück zu sehen. Ist doch die Wirkung eines Werkes sehr verschieden je nach der Resonanz der Persönlichkeit, auf die es trifft. **Infolgedessen ist nicht nur die Persönlichkeit des Künstlers, sondern auch des Empfangenden nicht nur einer ästhetischen, sondern auch einer ethischen Einwirkung zu unterstellen.** Zu deren Mitteln kann es bei Jugendlichen, aber auch bei sittlich Unreifen gehören, daß die Zugänglichkeit eines Kunstwerkes beschränkt werden muß. Nicht jedes objektiv unanstößige Kunstwerk ist derart, daß jedes Kind es im öffentlichen Buchladen erwerben darf, nicht jedes Theaterstück — etwa in Revolutionszeiten — zur öffentlichen Aufführung vor einer leicht entzündlichen Menge geeignet. Solche Einschränkungen werden nicht untergeordneten polizeilichen Organen anvertraut werden können, ebensowenig Künstlern allein, die geneigt sind, ästhetische über ethische Gesichtspunkte zu stellen. Es müssen vielmehr Instanzen gebildet werden, in denen die verschiedensten an der Frage interessierten Kreise vertreten sind d. h. neben den Künstlern Organe des Staates, der Schule und auch der Kirche.

Ein besonders Problem in des Sellung des christlichen Charakters zur Kunst hat das **Theater** gebildet. Das zeigt der geschicht-

liche Verlauf. Während aus der Zeit des normativen Urchristentums keinerlei Urteile vorliegen, hat die alte Kirche eine lebhafte Polemik gegen die Schauspiele eröffnet, wie z. B. in Tertullians Schrift „de spectaculis." Die Motive sind aber deutlich in der besonderen Situation des antiken Theaters zu sehen, das in dieser Zeit nicht nur spezifischer Repräsentant heidnischer Religion und Sittlichkeit, sondern auch Unsittlichkeit aller Art war. Im Lauf des Mittelalters wurde die Stellung der Kirche freundlicher und sie nahm selbst theatralische Darstellungen in der Form der Mysterienspiele mit christlichem Stoff auf. Für sie hatte auch Luther Sympathie; verlangte aber von jedem Theater christlich moralische Tendenz. Gegenüber dem immer selbständiger gewordenen modernen Theater eröffneten Orthodoxie und Pietismus einen neuen heißen Kampf. Im 18. Jahrhundert begann die unter dem Einfluß des Rationalismus und Idealismus stehende Kirche sich dem Theater gegenüber mindestens neutral, wenn nicht sogar anerkennend zu verhalten. Bis in die Gegenwart ist die Stellung der christlichen Kirche eine zwiespältige geblieben, und die ablehnende Meinung hat durch neue Formen der Darbietung wie im Kino eine Stärkung erfahren. — Das Theater in seinen verschiedenen Formen bringt weiteren Kreisen die eindruckvollste Vermittlung der Kunst, deren verschiedene Formen, Wort, Ton, Bild sich hier einigen und den künstlerisch schaffenden Menschen am unmittelbarsten in Erscheinung treten und wirken lassen. Aber der Unterschied ist gegenüber andern Künsten kein prinzipieller, sondern nur ein gradueller: **Darum gelten die allgemein für die Stellung des christlichen Charakters zur Kunst entwickelten Prinzipien auch für das Theater.** Weder über seine Formen noch seine Stoffe hat die Ethik von sich aus zu entscheiden. Das ganze Drama der Welt kann auf den Brettern gespielt werden. Aber auch hier gelten — und zwar im verschärften Maß — die ethischen Anforderungen gegenüber den Darstellenden und Genießenden.

Eine besondre Frage ist die nach der Zulässigkeit, im engsten Sinn religiöse und kultische Vorgänge darzustellen. Kein Geringerer als Goethe hat Schiller geraten, in seinem Stück Maria Stuart die Darreichung des Abendmahls sich nicht auf offener Szene vollziehen zu lassen, und R. Wagner hat nicht gewünscht, daß sein Bühnenweihfestspiel Parsifal überall dargestellt werde. In der Tat ist es nicht nur für die Darsteller schwer, wenn nicht geradezu unmöglich, künstlerische Leistung und echt religiöse Haltung zu verbinden und nicht minder für die Zuschauer das Aesthetische zugleich als heilig zu empfinden. **Darum wird ein entsprechender Takt die direkte Erscheinung geweihter christlicher Persönlichkeiten und Vorgänge auf der gewöhnlichen Bühne vermeiden und sie besondern Spielen vorbehalten.** Auf der andern Seite aber liegt es durchaus

nicht im Interesse des Christentums, wenn vom Theater alle religiösen Figuren und Gedanken verbannt werden. Denn gerade hier können sie eine besonders eindrucksvolle Form gewinnen und Hörer erreichen, denen sie sonst nicht zugänglich sind. Ein spezifisch christliches Theater und überhaupt eine christliche Kunst wird freilich nur da möglich und wirklich, wo christliche Charaktere und künstlerische Begabung sich völlig frei von innen heraus miteinander verbinden.

Das Alte Testament der Bibel in dem Neuen Testament.

Von Dr. C. Schieler.

Die moderne Bibelkritik, welche sich auch anzupreisen liebt als die „Höhere Bibelkritik" und unter dieser falschen Flagge Tausende für sich zu gewinnen verstand und es noch tut, scheidet manche Stellen der Heiligen Schrift aus als unecht, eingeschoben im Lauf der Jahrhunderte durch die Abschreiber der Bibel, bezeichnet ganze Bücher der Bibel als unecht, sie seien nicht von den angeblichen Autoren geschrieben, stammten aus viel späterer Zeit, könnten also nicht als Wort Gottes gelten. Dadurch ist der Grundcharakter der Bibel, ihre ganze Hoheit und Heiligkeit, ihr alle anderen Bücher weit, weit überragender Wert vernichtet. Denn nichts Schlimmeres kann man gegen ein Buch aussagen, als daß es unecht, unglaubwürdig sei. Und doch sind alle diese Einwendungen gegen die Bibel als Ganzes und gegen einzelne Teile derselben im Lauf der Zeit gründlich als nicht stichhaltig, als wertlos, zum Teil als lächerlich von ernstdenkenden, wissenschaftlich hochgebildeten Männern, Theologen und Nichttheologen zurückgewiesen worden. Dennoch tauchen sie wieder auf, zuweilen in neuem Gewand, und man preist dies Verfahren als moderne Bibelkritik.

Insbesondre richteten sich von jeher die Angriffe auf das Alte Testament und in diesem auf die Bücher Mosis, den Pentateuch. Es soll nicht meine Aufgabe sein, hier die gegen dieselben vorgebrachten Einwände zu wiederholen und zu widerlegen; es wäre doch nutzlos. Es handelt sich hier um die Frage: **Ist das Alte Testament Wort Gottes wie das Neue Testament, das Alte Testament in allen seinen Teilen,** zusammengenannt: „Moses und die Propheten." Es handelt sich um die Frage: **Ist die ganze Bibel in all ihren Teilen Wort Gottes?** Ein Wissenschaftler unsrer Tage, der sich eines großen Rufes erfreut, aber kein Theologe ist, bekennt freimütig nach langem, eifrigen, sorgfältigen Studium, nachdem er eine Zeit lang irregeführt von der modernen Bibelkritik andrer Ansicht gewesen war: „Ich bin sicher und gewiß, daß die Bibel Wort Gottes ist, und diese Gewißheit ist für mich größer als alle andern Ueberzeugungen, die meinen Lauf in dieser kurzen irdischen Pilgerschaft leiten. Ueber alle jene Maxime, welche die praktischen Beziehungen des Lebens regulieren und die aus Erfahrung stammen, über alle jene logischen Schlußfolgerungen aus philosophischen und wissenschaftlichen Sätzen, stelle ich das helle Licht der Wahrheit, welches aus den Blättern der Bibel hervorstrahlt. Aber man sagt mir: ‚Sie meinen doch natürlich, **Teile der Bibel** und nehmen aus jene Mythen des Alten Testaments von einem

Nomadenvolk und geben zu, daß ein gewisser Nebel über die Ueberlieferungen der ersten Zeiten ausgebreitet ist?' Nein, antworte ich ganz bestimmt; ich muß nicht ausscheiden und weglassen und Ausnahmen und Zugeständnisse machen; konstanter Gebrauch hat mich gelehrt, die **ganze** Bibel als Wort Gottes anzunehmen." Das ist das Urteil eines gebildeten Laien, welcher der erkannten Wahrheit Zeugnis gibt.

Der spanische Philosoph Balmes will ebenfalls nichts von Ausnahmen oder Zugeständnissen wissen; das Alte wie das Neue Testament sind ihm Wort Gottes. „Man hat hier ein Buch," schreibt er, „welches in einem engen Rahmen den ungeheuren Zeitraum von 4000 Jahren enthält, und dadurch, daß es den Ursprung und das Schicksal des Menschen wie des ganzen Weltalls umfaßt, bis in die Tiefen der fernsten Zukunft fortschreitet; ein Buch, das in die Geschichte eines auserwählten Volkes, die es verfolgt, in seinen Erzählungen und Weissagungen die Revolutionen gewaltiger Reiche einflicht; ein Buch, das neben den prächtigen Gemälden von der Macht und dem glänzenden Reichtum orientalischer Monarchen in naiven Zügen die Einfachheit der häuslichen Sitten, die Reinheit und die Unschuld eines kindlichen Volkes schildert; ein Buch, wo der Geschichtschreiber erzählt, der Weise ruhig seine Sittensprüche darlegt, der Gelehrte unterrichtet und auf Streitfragen eingeht; ein Buch, wo der Prophet unter dem Einfluß des göttlichen Geistes gegen die Verderbnis und die Verirrung des Volkes donnert, die Rache Gottes vom Sinai verkündigt, aber untröstlich die Gefangenschaft seiner Brüder, die Verwüstung und Verödung seines Vaterlandes beweint, wo er in einer herrlichen und erhabenen Sprache die prächtigen Schauspiele erzählt, die sich vor seinem Auge enthüllt haben, wenn er in Augenblicken der Verzückung wie durch dunkle Schleier in geheimnisvollen Gestalten, Sinnbildern und rätselhaften Wesen die Ereignisse der Gesellschaft und die Hauptbegebenheiten der Natur vor sich vorübergehen sah; in Buch, oder, um es besser zu sagen, eine Sammlung von Büchern, worin alle Schreibarten herrschen, wo die mannigfaltigsten Erzählungen aufeinander folgen, die Majestät des Epos, die Einfachheit der Idylle, die Ode mit ihrem feurigen Schwung, die besonnene Didaktik, die historische Erzählung mit ihrem ernsten, ruhigen Gang, das lebendige und rasche Drama; eine Sammlung von Büchern endlich, welche in verschiedenen Zeiträumen und Ländern, wie in verschiedenen Sprachen unter den außerordentlichsten und außergewöhnlichsten Umständen geschrieben wurden."

Daraus geht aber schon von selbst hervor, daß gerade das volle Verständnis der verschiedenen Bücher des Alten Testaments, insbesondre der Bücher Mosis, die volle Würdigung ihres Inhaltes eine gewisse Kenntnis der örtlichen Beschaffenheit, der Zeiten, der

Gesetze, der Gebräuche, der Sitten verlangt. Daher kommen so viele Mißverständnisse, falsche Deutungen, schiefe Urteile, weil man an diese Bücher des Alten Testamets ohne die nötigen Vorkenntnisse herantritt. Deshalb haben ja so viele namhafte Gelehrte versucht, diese vergangenen Jahrhunderte unserm modernen Denken und Urteilen zu erschließen.

Nicht nur ist alles, was das Alte Testament uns erzählt, wie die ganze heilige Schrift vollkommen verbürgt, sie gibt auch die klarsten Aufschlüsse über die wichtigsten Fragen und Tatsachen der Urgeschichte der Menschheit, von welchen die Heiden nur noch sehr dunkle Erinnerungen bewahrten, und worüber ihre weisesten Männer nur unsichere Vermutungen auszusprechen vermochten, und worüber auch unsre modernen Wissenschaftler bis jetzt nur ganz unwahrscheinliche Hypothesen, sich widersprechende Meinungen aufstellen. Sie führt uns den **Kern der Geschichte** vor Augen, gibt uns den Schlüssel zum einzig befriedigenden Verständnis der Weltgeschichte mit all ihren ernsten Verwicklungen. Sie zeigt uns nämlich, wie in der so mannigfach verschlungenen Geschichte der Völker und dem Auftreten ihrer großen Männer die göttliche Vorsehung sichtbar und wunderbar über einzelnen Personen und Völkern und über dem ganzen Menschengeschlecht waltete und noch waltet. Daneben stellt sie uns in den schlagendsten Beispielen die Liebenswürdigkeit der Tugend und die Abscheulichkeit des Lasters vor. Sie enthüllt uns den ganzen wunderbaren Heilsplan, den Gott von Ewigkeit her zur Erlösung des gefallenen Menschengeschlechtes bestimmt, und den er im Verlauf der Zeit mit göttlicher Weisheit und Liebe entfaltet und endlich auf das herrlichste verwirklicht hat. Wir sehen demgemäß gerade im Alten Testament, wie seit dem Sündenfall der ersten Menschen alles nach Gottes allmächtiger und gnadenvoller Leitung auf die Ankunft des Erlösers hinzielt und darauf mehr und mehr vorbereitet, bis endlich in der Fülle der Zeiten Gottes eingeborner Sohn Mensch wird und der Menschheit Erlösung und ewiges Heil bringt.

Wir sehen hieraus, daß **Jesus Christus der Mittelpunkt** der ganzen Entwicklung der Menschheit, die Sonne der Weltgeschichte ist. Aber noch viel mehr und unmittelbarer hat in der Geschichte des Alten Testaments alles Bezug auf Christus, und man wird sie gar nicht verstehen können, wenn man nicht weiß und beachtet, daß das ganze Alte Testament nur ein Vorbild von Jesus Christus und dem ganzen Neuen Testament ist, freilich ein schwaches Vorbild, ein „Schatten," wie Paulus es bezeichnet, „ein Schatten von dem, das zukünftig war," Kol. 2, 17. Und Augustinus sagt: „Das Neue Testament ist in dem Alten enthalten und das Alte ist durch das Neue erklärt." An einer andern Stelle sagt derselbe große Gelehrte: „Wem sich im Alten Testament Christus offenbart, der

wisse, daß er es verstanden hat; bevor er aber Christum in ihm gefunden, maße er sich nicht an, es verstanden zu haben . . . . Aus keinem andern Grund ist vor der Ankunft des Herrn alles geschrieben, was wir in den heiligen Schriften lesen, als, damit seine Ankunft verkündet und seine Kirche vorgebildet werde."

Nicht nur durch die **Weissagungen der Propheten** hat Gott mit ausdrücklichen Worten auf den kommenden Erlöser hingewiesen und ihn in den einzelnen Zügen seiner Ankunft und Geburt, seines Lebens, Leidens und Sterbens und seiner Auferstehung und Verherrlichung auf das genaueste vorher dargestellt, sondern er wollte sich auch der **tatsächlichen Hinweisung** und Vorausdarstellung durch Vorbilder, teils persönlicher (Abraham, Isaak, Jakob, Moses und andre mehr), teils sachlicher Art (eherne Schlange, Osterlamm, Wasser aus dem Felsen, Opfer und andre mehr) im reichsten Maße bedienen. Daher bildete er den Erlöser und seine Kirche in der ganzen Geschichte des israelitischen Volkes und in all den verschiedenen Personen und Einrichtungen des Alten Bundes im voraus ab, indem er diesen die verschiedensten Züge der Aehnlichkeit mit dem Erlöser und seinem Werk gab. Darum sagt der Apostel Paulus, daß das, was bei den Israeliten geschehen ist, ein Vorbild dessen gewesen sei, was sich bei den Christen erfüllt habe, und seine sämtlichen Briefe, besonders aber der an die Hebräer weisen dies im einzelnen nach. So bemerkt er von den Zeremonien, welche den Juden im Gesetz vorgeschrieben waren: „Sie sind ein Schatten dessen, was zukünftig ist, die Sache aber ist Christus." (Kol. 2, 17; vergleiche Hebr. 8, 5; 10, 1.)

Aeltere Ausleger, in auffallender Uebereinstimmung, nennen das Alte Testament den Kern oder die Knospe, das Neue Testament dagegen die Frucht oder die entfaltete Rose. „Der ganze Alte Bund," sagt Augustinus, „ist eine Verhüllung des Neuen." So besteht ein inniger Zusammenhang zwischen dem Alten und dem Neuen Testament; beide bilden das Eine, heilige Buch der Bücher, die Bibel, die Heilige Schrift. Das eine wäre unvollständig ohne das andre. Und kein Teil, kein Buch des Alten Testaments ist hiervon auszunehmen.

Ein heftiger Kampf entbrannte in neurer Zeit um die Authentizität und Glaubwürdigkeit der fünf Bücher Mosis, namentlich seitdem ein Professor einer deutschen Universität von den Mythen des Alten Testaments: Erschaffung, Sündenfall, Sintflut Turmbau von Babel geredet und ein Buch darüber veröffentlicht hat. Und bis auf den heutigen Tag spricht man noch von Mythen des Alten Testaments und lehrt dies die theologische Jugend, und natürlich tauchen solche Ungeheuerlichkeiten sogar in Sonntagschullektionen in offner oder versteckter Form auf. Deshalb darf diese Frage hier nicht ganz übergangen werden.

Der Bericht der Bücher des Moses erstreckt sich über dritthalb Jahrtausende, von Erschaffung der Welt an bis auf den Tod des Moses. Ihren Namen haben sie davon, daß sie von dem großen Diener Gottes, Moses, abgefaßt worden sind. Hiefür spricht das einstimmige Zeugnis aller Schriften des Alten Testaments von Josua an, die einstimmige jüdische Ueberlieferung von jeher, die sogar den heidnischen Schriftstellern des Altertums bekannt war und die von Jesus ausdrücklich bestätigt ist. In einer Rede gegen die Juden, die Pharisäer und Schriftgelehrten (Joh. 5, 46. 47) sagte er nämlich: „Wenn ihr Mose glaubtet, so glaubtet ihr auch mir; denn er hat von mir geschrieben. So ihr aber **seinen Schriften** nicht glaubet, wie werdet ihr meinen Worten glauben." Die Apostel haben nicht anders gelehrt. Schon das eben angeführte Wort Jesu sollte alles Bedenken und allen Zweifel beseitigen. Er ist die Wahrheit, und jedes seiner Worte ist Wahrheit.

Auch die Bücher selbst zeigen durch auffallende Eigentümlichkeiten, daß sie von Moses verfaßt sind und nur von einem Autor wie Moses herstammen können. Schon die altertümliche Sprache und die genaue Kenntnis der Verhältnisse deuten auf ihn, während die vier letzten Bücher uns das israelitische Volk in einer Lage zeigen, **wie sie nur unter Moses war.** — Die **Gesetze** stehen nicht dem Inhalt nach und systematisch geordnet beisammen, wie es ein späterer Verfasser, nach Moses, sicher am zweckmäßigsten erachtet wurden, untermischt mit Ereignissen, zum Teil solchen, die Abänderungen, Ergänzungen, ja Aufhebung früherer Gesetze veranlassen; viele beziehen sich ausdrücklich auf die noch bevorstehende Eroberung Kanaans und die dort erst eintretenden Verhältnisse. — Im letzten dieser Bücher finden wir **Ermahnungen,** so frisch und lebendig, so warm und innig, wie sie sich nur bei dem großen, von Gott selbst gesendeten Führer dieses Volkes, bei Moses, erwarten lassen. — Endlich ist **Moses ausdrücklich als Verfasser genannt,** sowohl bei einzelnen Stellen, als auch am Schluß einzelner Bücher und am Ende des ganzen Werkes. Als Beispiele mögen dienen: 2. Mose 17, 4: Und der Herr sprach zu Moses: „Schreibe das zum Gedächtnis in ein Buch und befiehl's in die Ohren Josuas . . . ." 2. Mos. 24, 4: „Da schrieb Moses alle Worte des Herrn . . . ." Vers 7: „Und nahm das Buch des Bundes und las es vor den Ohren des Volkes . . . ." 3. Mos. 26, 46: „Das sind die Satzungen und Rechte und Gesetze, die der Herr zwischen ihm selbst und den Kindern Israel gestellt hat auf dem Berg Sinai durch die Hand des Moses," vergleiche 27, 34. und 4. Mos. 36, 13; besonders beachtenswert ist 5. Mos. 31, 9: „Und Moses schrieb das Gesetz und gab's den Priestern" usw. (Dies Buch sollte alle sieben Jahre dem versammelten Volk vorgelesen werden, auf daß ihre „Kinder, die es nicht wissen, es auch hören . . . .") Und in

Vers 24 desselben Kapitels heißt es: „Da nun Moses die Worte dieses Gesetzes ganz ausgeschrieben hatte in ein Buch, gebot er den Leviten . . . . Nehmt das Buch dieses Gesetzes und legt es an die Seite der Lade des Bundes des Herrn . . . ."

Wahrlich, welches Buch des Altertums ist so beglaubigt wie der Pentateuch des Moses? Und welches Buch des Altertums, dessen Authentizität und Glaubwürdigkeit die Gelehrten ohne Anstand anerkennen, verdient mehr Glauben als diese Bücher Mosis? Und muß man nicht, vorurteilsfrei urteilend, zugeben, daß Moses wie kein andrer die Wahrheit sagen konnte und wollte, ja in Anbetracht der Verhältnisse sagen mußte, und daß er durch die Größe seines Geistes und die Reinheit seines Charakters, wie durch die Heiligkeit seines Lebens und den edlen Zweck seines ganzen Bestrebens jeden Verdacht der Unwahrheit ausschließt. Bei den Ereignissen, welche die vier letzten Bücher mitteilen, war er Augenzeuge, ja die Hauptperson, wie denn auch die Darstellung eine Bekanntschaft mit allem verrät, wie nur der Führer dieses Volkes sie haben konnte.

Anders verhält es sich mit dem Inhalt des ersten Buches, insbesondre der ersten Kapitel. Mit der Erschaffung der Welt aus Nichts beginnt das erste Kapitel und damit das ganze Alte Testament, und diese einfache Art ist dabei doch wieder so großartig, wie es sich für das Buch der Bücher geziemt. „**Im Anfang** d. h. als außer dem ewigen Gott noch nichts da war, und mit der Welt die Zeit erst begann, **erschuf Gott,** d. h. brachte aus nichts hervor, was nur dem allmächtigen Gott zukommt, während die Menschen nur aus vorhandenem Stoff zu bilden, zu gestalten vermögen, **Himmel und Erde.**" Moses gebrauchte sehr bezeichnender Weise das Wort „bara" = erschuf; dies Wort kommt an vielen Stellen der Bibel des Alten Testaments vor, ist aber stets nur von göttlicher, nie von geschöpflicher Tätigkeit gebraucht. Damit steht allerdings die neuere Naturwissenschaft in direktem Widerspruch. Sie nimmt an, die Welt sei ewig, von jeher dagewesen. Und sie hat eine ganze Reihe von Theorien hierüber aufgestellt, die sich widersprechen; zudem muß eine jede Theorie erst richtig bewiesen werden, um als sicher angenommen werden zu können, und jede ermangelt eines stringenten Beweises. Woher hat nun Moses diese seine Kenntnis vom Ursprung der Welt? Auch hierüber hat man Theorien aufgestellt, während doch die naheliegende und einzig richtige Erklärung ist: **sie beruht auf göttlicher Offenbarung, eben weil sie ein Teil des Wortes Gottes ist, der Anfang der Heiligen Schrift.** Für die folgenden Berichte standen Moses schriftliche Aufzeichnungen in den patriarchalischen Familien (die in Abrede zu stellen gar kein Grund vorliegt) zur Verfügung, und er erhielt auch durch mündliche Ueberlieferung sichere Aufschlüsse. Denn wegen der anfänglich sehr ho-

hen Lebensdauer der Menschen reichen von Moses zurück fünf oder sechs Zwischenglieder hin, um eine vollständig sichere und zuverlässige Ueberlieferung zu verbürgen. Adam lebte nach den Zeitangaben der Bibel selbst noch 56 Jahre mit Lamech, dem Vater des Noah; Lamech noch 93 Jahre mit seinem Enkel Sem; dieser noch 50 Jahre mit Isaak und dieser noch 33 Jahre mit seinem Enkel Levi, dem Stammvater des Mose, zusammen. Levi kam 51 Jahre alt mit Jakob nach Aegypten und lebte dort noch 86 Jahre; Moses aber wurde 80 Jahre vor dem Ende der ägyptischen Knechtschaft geboren, die 430 Jahre dauerte. Mithin konnte dem Moses sein Großvater oder Urgroßvater aus dem Mund Levis selbst über dessen Vater Jakob und über die Patriarchen vor ihm die zuverlässigsten Mitteilungen machen. Auch muß auf die **merkwürdige Uebereinstimmung der Ueberlieferung aller alten Völker** mit den Berichten der Bibel hinsichtlich der wichtigsten Tatsachen, die sie erzählt, mit Nachdruck hingewiesen werden, besonders über die Erschaffung der ganzen Welt, die Erschaffung eines Menschen als Stammvaters der ganzen Menschheit, über dessen Unschuld und glückliches Leben im Paradies, über die Sintflut, den Turmbau von Babel, die Sprachverwirrung und die Zerstreuung der Menschen. (Siehe hierüber Lüken, „Die Traditionen des Menschengeschlechtes.“) Schließlich kommen in Betracht die Anklänge der auf den Keilinschriftentäfelchen der Bibliothek Asurbanipals, des assyrischen Königs.

Daher konnte Jesus in der bekannten Parabel vom reichen Mann sagen: „Sie,“ die lebenden Menschen, „haben **Moses und die Propheten**; laß sie dieselben hören . . . . Hören sie Moses und die Propheten nicht, so werden sie auch nicht glauben, wenn jemand von den Toten auferstünde.“ (Luk. 16, 29 und 31.) „Suchet in der Schrift; denn ihr meinet, ihr habet das ewige Leben darin; und sie ist's, die von mir zeuget,“ sprach Jesus zu den Schriftgelehrten. Die Schrift aber von welcher hier die Rede ist, konnte nur das Alte Testament sein (Joh. 5, 39). Als der Auferstandene mit den Emmausjüngern ging, „fing er an von Mose und allen Propheten und legte ihnen alle Schriften aus, die von ihm gesagt waren,“ und „ihr Herz brannte,“ da er mit ihnen redete auf dem Weg, „als er uns die Schrift öffnete.“ Joh. 24, 27. 32.

Im einzelnen erwähnt Jesus Sodom und Gomorra (Mark. 6, 11 und Luk. 10, 12), diesen unglücklichen Städten werde es am Jüngsten Gericht erträglicher ergehen als jenen Städten, welche die Apostel und ihre Botschaft nicht aufnehmen würden. Auch in 2. Petri 2, 6 und in Offenbarung Johannes wird Sodom erwähnt. „Gedenket an des Lot Weib!“ ruft der Heiland (Luk. 17, 32) aus, und vergleicht die Zeit Lots mit den letzten Zeiten Luk. 17, 28 ff.

In demselben Kapitel erwähnt er Noah und die Sintflut (Vers 26). In der Apostelgeschichte finden sich sehr viele Beziehungen auf die im Alten Testament erzählten Geschichten und die in demselben enthaltenen Lehren. Sie einzeln anzuführen, würde der erlaubte Raum nicht hinreichen.

Ueber den Zusammenhang des Alten und Neuen Testamentes schreibt der bekannte Professor Schlatter: „Jesus bewährt seine Gemeinschaft mit Israel dadurch, daß er die ihm überlieferten Schriften als das göttliche Wort ehrt und gebraucht wie jeder fromme Jude. In dem, was er über Moses und die Propheten sagt, und in der Zuversicht, mit der er sie sich in jedem Ausdruck als das unverwandelbare Zeugnis des göttlichen Willens aneignet, unterscheidet er sich von der übrigen Gemeinde nicht. Er erkennt seinen Beruf vielmehr darin, die Schrift gegen die Gemeinde und ihren Lehrstand zu verteidigen, weil sie von ihnen gebrochen wird." Man beachte hierbei besonders die Lehren Jesu, wie er sie in der Bergpredigt (Matth. 5 und 6) vorträgt, ferner seine Worte an die Pharisäer: „Habt ihr nicht gelesen, daß, der im Anfang den Menschen gemacht hat (1. Mos. 1 und 2), der machte, daß ein Mann ein Weib sein sollte," endlich auch seinen Vorwurf gegen dieselben Pharisäer: „Warum übertretet ihr denn Gottes Gebot um eurer Aufsätze (Ueberlieferung) willen? Denn Gott hat gesprochen: Ehre den Vater und die Mutter usw. . . . . Ihr aber saget: ‚Wer irgend zu dem Vater oder der Mutter spricht: ein Geschenk, was du nur von mir zu Nutze haben solltest, der braucht dann auch nicht seinen Vater und seine Mutter zu ehren.' Und so habt ihr das Gesetz Gottes um eurer Ueberlieferung willen ungültig gemacht. Heuchler . . . ." Jesu Anklage gegen die Juden lautet, daß sie die Schrift brechen, er aber beweist seine Sohnschaft Gottes dadurch, daß er der Schrift gehorcht.

Ebenso war die Berufung auf die Schrift von Anfang an ein Hauptstück der apostolischen Predigt. Sie war von der Gewißheit getragen, daß in Jesu Werk und Lehre alles zur Erfüllung gelange, was die Schrift verheiße und gebiete. Darum haben auch die griechisch redenden christlichen Gemeinden mit dem Wort der Apostel sofort die Schrift erhalten und die Briefe der Apostel machen sichtbar, mit welchem Eifer und ernst die Verlesung der Schrift als ein Hauptstück des urchristlichen Gottesdienstes geübt wurde. Als dann später das Evangelium dazu kam, entstand ein neues Verhältnis der Christenheit zur Schrift; sie war dann nicht mehr das einzige Band, das die Gemeinde mit Christus verknüpfte. Aber die Schrift blieb mit dem Evangelium verbunden; die Schrift fand ihre Erfüllung im Evangelium. Die Aussage der Schrift wurde sofort und vollständig mit dem verbunden, was ihr jetzt durch die Erkenntnis des Christus als Gottes Werk geworden ist.

Je mehr der Theologe, vom Geist Gottes geleitet und erleuchtet, in das Studium des Alten Testaments sich versenkt, desto reicher werden ihm Gedanken, Anregungen und Mahnungen für sein Werk zuströmen, desto reicheren Stoff an guten Lehren und kräftigen Beispielen, zutreffenden Illustrationen für Predigt und Unterricht wird er finden. Und dieser Stoff hat den ungeheuren Vorteil, daß er die Autorität des Wortes Gottes, den sichtbaren Stempel der Wahrheit an sich trägt. Darum gelte auch heute noch, und besonders heute wieder das Wort des allseitigen Schriftkenners, unsers Reformators:

„Das Wort, sie sollen lassen stahn
Und kein'n Dank dazu haben.
Er ist bei uns wohl auf dem Plan
Mit seinem Geist und Gaben."

EDITORIALS

THE LAYMEN'S FOREIGN MISSIONS INQUIRY

The report of the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry has been published and is now before us in a book (by Harper & Bros.) entitled "Rethinking Missions." To many the report may have come as a surprise because they did not know that such an enterprise was under way. Mr. Hutchinson (of the "Christian Century") gives us some information about the history of the Inquiry (that John D. Rockefeller Jr. was, in a way, the spiritual father and main financial backer; that the fact-finding took several years; and that the whole enterprise was done in a most thorough and competent fashion).

The findings and recommendations of the report are far-reaching. The missionary personnel is often, so it says, very inadequate, consisting of many men and women of narrow outlook. Besides, they are dependent on their boards and are expected to produce results, converts, local churches. We cannot go here, into this question; we want to dwell more specifically on the real crux of the situation, the position the report takes on the *Christian message*. Our approach to the heathen world, it says, was negative in the past. The heathen needed missionaries to save them from hell-fire. Today our approach is affirmative, we bring them Christ that they might have life abundant. In distinction from the past, too, we see a world culture emerge, to which all races (especially those of Eastern Asia) contribute, not the western nations only. Every religion has its good joints. The missionary ought to be willing to share with Hindu, Mohammedan, Confucionist on a basis of give and take. We expected in the past to convert all Asia, etc., and to supplant all the religions now in existence. We have given up that hope now. These foreign religions will continue to exist. Let them all contribute their share to the religion of the future. The missionary ought to see his chief foe not in "paganism," not in Buddhist or Moslem or Taoist, but in atheism and materialism. He ought to ally himself with all the good elements in heathen religions in a battle against the common adversary, the materialist and godless. The *coming world religion* is the *New Testament of every faith*. We are not sent into the heathen world to teach a creed. We are sent to show by our own life how Christ lived, not what he thought about God or his relation to God.

How has this report been received by churches and individuals so far? The "Christian Century" rejoices over the fact that Modernism seems to be in the leading position in the churches represented in this report. This is the first time that Modernism has undertaken to challenge the church with its criticism of one of her main activities. The "Christian Century" wonders whether Modernism is ready to take over the missionary concern.

The voices from the churches vary considerably. Congregationalists and some Baptists and Methodists are favorable. Others condemn the theological views of the report utterly. The General Council of the Presbyterian church calls it a virtual denial of Christianity. Christianity is not one religion among many. It has from the beginning withstood all efforts at syncretism. The report had said that we should look to the "continued existence of the other religions with Christianity, each stimulating the other in growth, towards the ultimate goal, *unity in the completest religious truth.*" Over against this the General Council emphasizes that Christ is our only and all-sufficient Saviour.

What will be our attitude? The Editor has no hesitation in saying that he entirely agrees with the Presbyterian Council. The report ought to be studied with all the attention it can justly demand. But on the heart of the Christian message it strikes a wrong note. Christ is not only an example, an inspiration, as the Modernists generally claim. It is not enough to say, see how Christ lived and then try to follow in his footsteps. He who said: "I am the resurrection and the life . . ." is more than merely a great ethical teacher. He is the giver of life in supreme fashion. The whole New Testamnet attributes to him a cosmic significance. His name is the only name given among men by which they might be saved. And "no one knoweth the Father but the Son and to whom the Son will reveal it."

This is the message with which Jesus sent out his disciples and with which they conquered paganism. It wasn't preaching alone, but preaching backed by life; but to say like one of the report's supporters said: "Live it, don't preach it; I am weary unto death of your incessant preaching" (Mrs. Pearl S. Buck), is absurd.

Will Modernism be able, or is it ready to take over the missionary enterprise? asks the "Christian Century." We don't think it will. In the past foreign missions have always been promoted by the conservative forces of the church. Think of the older as well as the modern Pietism (from August H. Francke, Zinzendorf and the Moravians down to the Mission houses of Basel, Bremen, Berlin and other places (the latter playing such an important part

in our own church). We dare believe it will be so in the future. Modernism can teach us to be forward looking and give due regard to reason, but as to the heart of the gospel, it seems to be still true, "Thou hast revealed it to babes and hidden it from the wise and prudent."

IS MAN SAVED BY FAITH OR BY CHARACTER?

It was a hundred years ago that Channing answered this question for himself and the Unitarians by boldly declaring that man is saved by character, not by faith. Since this statement is an outright reversal of the position of all the Reformers, one might wonder how a Protestant minister and leader could ever get away so far from the faith of his fathers. However, one has to consider that in Channing's time the diversity of sects was so great in this country and their insistence on their particular dogmas so pronounced that a thinking theologian would very well raise the question, Is religion a matter of belief or of life and character? For, to accept a dogma or a set of teachings requires merely mental assent. It can only be called a belief. It is not at all the *faith* which according to the Reformers—and Paul—brings salvation.

Moreover, it was not Channing who initiated this opposition to dogma. He inherited only what had been the prevailing religious attitude in Europe for many years. The fierce strife of the confessions had in Germany brought about the powerful reaction of the "Enlightenment." Reason had been enthroned in place of revelation and authoritative faith. A man was to accept of religion only what had the approval of his reason, a so-called "natural religion," i.e., God, freedom (or virtue) and immortality. Everything that was not compatible with reason, especially everything that was miraculous, was to be rejected. Of course, there was to be room for difference of opinion, difference also of religion. In this respect the main requirement was "tolerance," the watchword of the new age. *That* religion was the best that produced sweet reasonableness and a spirit of brotherhood (Lessing's "Nathan the Wise"). We see the same spirit and attitude as that of Channing.

This present writer had his attention called to this matter by an address by a Jewish rabbi at the regular meeting of our Evangelical Ministers of this city (Cleveland). He spoke on the new "Fellowship of Faiths," that had had a very enthusiastic reception in the local Cathedral of the Episcopal Church itself and been heartily endorsed by Bishop Rogers of this diocese. This league, the rabbi said, is an organization of people of different faiths and convictions whose object is to help its members to understand each other. Even communists and atheists belong to it. It was pointed

out to him that a fellowship of faiths was only possible if the different individuals had something in common. A theist and an atheist might each have convictions but their convictions were so antagonistic that they provided no common ground to stand on.

In the course of the discussion one brother asked the rabbi what the real and ultimate aim of this new movement was. He answered, to bring its members to see that man is saved by character, not by his faith.

We are of the opinion that this rabbi expressed not only his own standpoint but that a great many in the Christian Church, on hearing him or others speak in that strain, might feel it was a very reasonable attitude. For it cannot be overlooked by one acquainted with modern tendencies that the "broadminded" person today is loath to consider the Christian religion as the only true one. He will not let us make a distinction between true and false religions, he will not even allow the Christian missionary to proselytize the heathen (Laymen's Missionary Report).

We hold that only the Christian religion is the true and adequate one. But, nevertheless, we never thought that mere belief, the mere mental acceptance of the Christian religion changed a man's life. When the Reformers taught that a man is saved by faith, they didn't mean, by mental assent. A man may say, I believe in the Bible from cover to cover. That won't mean much. The Reformers meant by faith the opening of the heart to spiritual fellowship, with God. If a man by such a state of heart and mind is put in touch with God in Christ, it will change his life, it will affect his character. He is indeed changed by faith. But he will never base his salvation on his character, for his character is and always will be imperfect. The Christian feels that his salvation must always be caused and guaranteed by God, not by man.

INTELLECTUAL HONESTY

A few years ago a book came out by James Halliday, which bore the startling title, "Robbing Youth of Its Religion" (see Book Review page 155). In it the writer contended that one great reason why young people, especially of the educated type, were kept from entering the Church and taking a real interest in it, was the fact that the Church was behind the times in its teaching. These young people, he said, all through the week were under the influence of science. They were taught that the world in which we live is an orderly world, in which there is a continuity of law. But when they come to the Church they seem to be in a different world, a world where miracles still occur, where God arbitrarily interferes in the affairs of man and in the course of nature. The preachers

in the pulpit and the teachers in Sunday School perform their task as though they were entirely ignorant that we are living in the twentieth century and not the sixteenth or the first. And the worst of it is, so the writer goes on, that many of these ministers know better. They are teaching things they don't believe themselves. They go on in the traditional way because they are afraid of the wrath of the fundamentalists in their congregations or their Synod. The result is that the young people turn their backs on the Church and its ministers because the latter are either not in touch with modern views or are not honest and courageous enough to say what they think.

This is no doubt a very serious charge. To say that the Church and its ministry are robbing youth of its religion by their lack of intellectual honesty, is about as terrible an accusation as can be made. It would be more convincing if the author could show that his own church is pursuing a different course and that, therefore, the young people are thronging its houses of worship. This is, however, far from being the case. He is a Unitarian and we still have to hear that they have more young people in their membership than other denominations. More than that, the Unitarian Church is over a hundred years old and is yet one of the smallest denominations in the country. They have had considerable influence through their intellectual leaders, great names are to be found in the chapters of their history. Still on the whole, they leave the great mass of people cold. The atmosphere in their churches, rationalistic as it is, does not seem conducive to spiritual growth. They seem to lack the strong convictions and emotional warmth people want.

So it does not appear as though a more scientific attitude on the part of the ministry would unfailingly fill the pews. There are other factors that account for the religious indifference that is so wide-spread. The general materialistic tendency of the age is a powerful influence in the situation. To make money and enjoy life has always been a mighty competitor for the supreme devotion of the soul. Perhaps never more so than today. We have the depression now. Some think they can discover a greater desire for spirituality as a result of hard times. But doubtless with prosperity coming in again, the old appetites will reassert themselves once more.

Nevertheless, although we cannot accept the charges of the writer as suported fully by the facts, there is some truth in what he says. Sometimes we fail in trying to solve the difficulties of those who are in intellectual confusion. Sometimes our younger ministers are at a loss what to say and how to meet modern doubts themselves, as was evidenced by a paper we printed in the *Magazine*

several years ago. ("The Dilemma of an Eden Graduate"). One should in such a case consider that congregations are not built up by preaching doubt or by attacking traditional attitudes. Faith and spiritual life can only be built up by the preaching of great affirmations and strong convictions. So in the pulpit we would advise a positive, constructive, creative kind of preaching. It is not necessary, no, it would be wrong for the preacher to preach what he doesn't believe himself. But as long as he has a grip on the vital verities of the faith, let him preach them.

If, however, in the Sunday school, or in personal intercourse, young people—or older ones—have their problems and difficulties on different things, such as miracles, or the limitations of the Old Testament, or everlasting punishment, or any other matter that is a stumbling block to them, let the minister speak frankly, wisely, with all the light at his disposal. He will then not be a destructive critic but by moving away obstacles prepare the way for a better understanding of our faith and a more whole-hearted appreciation of the Word.

Barth und der amerikanische Pastor.

Keller sagt von Karl Barth: „Wohin er kommt, sprühen die Funken. Jedermann fühlt, daß man sich mit ihm auseinander setzen muß; man kann ihn nicht ignorieren." Das scheint auch selbst in Amerika wahr zu sein. Hier hat er bisher noch am wenigsten Verständnis gefunden, aber doch scheut man sich, ihn links liegen zu lassen. Wir haben bisher immer unsre Theologie von dem europäischen Kontinent bezogen: Die „höhere Kritik," den Ritschlianismus, Ottos Numinosum. Sollten wir dann nun an Barth vorbeigehen können? Es ist ja ein Name, dem viel widersprochen wird, aber dürften wir doch nicht wenigstens versuchen, ihn zu verstehen?

Das scheint weithin die Geisteshaltung zu sein. Kürzlich erhielten die evangelischen Pastoren von Cleveland eine Einladung seitens ihrer reformierten Brüder, sich mit ihnen zu einer gemeinsamen Sitzung zusammen zu finden. Das Thema der Diskussion würde sein: Karl Barth! Wir stehen mit den Reformierten auf sehr freundschaftlichem Fuß und entsprachen gern der Einladung, obwohl das Thema nicht gerade vielversprechend schien.

Dr. Heyl, der Redakteur der „Reformierten Kirchenzeitung," war der Referent. Er unternahm auf Grund der „Prolegomena" Barths, dessen Tehologie in ihrem Grundriß zu entwickeln, indem er Barth meist selbst reden ließ. Er hob lobend hervor, daß Barth in den wesentlichen Zügen den orthodoxen Standpunkt vertrete, so in der Trinität (die er merkwürdigerweise schon in den Prolegomena auseinander legte), in der Christologie und der Lehre

von der Inspiration des göttlichen Wortes. Als Reformierter verfehlte der Referent nicht hervorzuheben, daß Barth die Souveränität Gottes und die Prädestination stark unterstreiche. Dr. Heyl sprach über eine Stunde, was in Anbracht des schwierigen Gegenstandes nicht zu verwundern war. Man konnte den Gesichtern der Zuhörer absehen, daß sie mit gespannter Aufmerksamkeit folgten oder zu folgen versuchten, aber auch daß sie bald müde wurden und den Kampf schließlich ganz aufgaben.

Dann folgte die Diskussion. Es wurde hervorgehoben, daß Barths Einfluß sich wirklich in allen protestantischen Ländern bemerkbar mache, wie Keller in seinem letzten Buch („Der Weg der dialektischen Theologie durch die Welt") gezeigt habe: zumeist in Deutschland, dann in der Schweiz, in Holland, Dänemark, Skandinavien, Schottland; weniger in England und am wenigsten in Amerika. Hier in unserm Land habe man am meisten Mühe, ihm nahezukommen. Der Amerikaner und seine Theologie sind optimistisch, Barth ist Pessimist. Sein Hauptaugenmerk ist darauf gerichtet, den Menschen klein zu machen. Der Abstand zwischen Gott und dem Menschen ist so groß, daß keine Brücke hinüberführt. Barth verwirft ganz und gar die Lehre von der Immanenz Gottes. Gott ist stets überweltlich. Er ist stets in der Ewigkeit und der Mensch in der Zeit. Gott und Mensch kommen nie zusammen. Auch in Christo nicht. Gott geht nie in die Geschichte ein. Was ist dann, so fragen wir, die Bedeutung der Inkarnation? Heißt es nicht deutlich: „Das Wort ward Fleisch und wohnte unter uns"? Sind denn nicht das Leben Jesu, seine Lehre, sein Leiden, Sterben und Auferstehen geschichtliche Tatsachen? Darauf gibt Barth sehr unbefriedigende Antwort. Nein, es sind keine geschichtlichen Tatsachen, selbst die Auferstehung ist keine eigentliche geschichtliche Tatsache. Ja, was ist sie denn? fragt der ungeduldige Zuhörer, ohne aber von Barth zufriedenstellende und aufhellende Unterweisung zu erhalten.

Auch Barths Lehre von dem „Wort Gottes," das doch eine so fundamentale Stellung in seinem System einnimmt, ist weder klar, noch annehmbar. Das Wort Gottes ist alles, was der Christ hat und es ist der Auftrag Gottes an den Prediger, an die Kirche. Auf Grund dessen steht er auf der Kanzel als der von Gott an die Gemeinde Gesandte. Aber wo ist das Wort Gottes? Wo hat er das Wort Gottes? In der Bibel, im Neuen Testament? Nein, das Neue Testament ist eine Zusammenhäufung von allerhand fehlbarem Menschenwort. Es ist vollständig der Kritik preisgegeben. Bultmann, ein Barthianer, sagt uns, daß wir von Christo, seiner Lehre und seinem Leben „wirklich nichts" wissen.

Und nicht nur das. Barth hält gar nichts von der subjektiven, erfahrungsmäßigen Erfassung des religiösen Lebens, vom religiö-

sen Erlebnis. Methodistische oder pietistische Erfahrung ist nichts als Gefühlstäuschung. Der Mensch kann Gott nie haben, nie besitzen, nie seines Heils froh werden. Hoffen und gehorchen ist alles, was er kann. Er kann so wenig „das Reich Gottes bauen," daß er nicht einmal sein eigenes Leben ethisch begründen und aufbauen kann. Die Kirche als Anstalt ist die „Synagoge Satans" geworden (Brunner). Mission kann sie nicht treiben, es fehlt ihr selbst der Geist Gottes und die rechte Verkündigung. Alles was die Kirche tun kann, ist warten auf Gott und sein kommendes Reich. Barth macht die Eschatologie wieder zu einem Glaubensartikel, ja zu dem „articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae" (mit dem die Kirche steht oder fällt).

So und anders äußerte sich die Zuhörerschaft, d. h. einige äußerten sich so. Die meisten äußerten sich nicht, weil Interesse und Verständnis fehlten.

Wir hatten den Eindruck, daß unsre Pastoren und mindestens ebenso die Reformierten auf Barths Botschaft auch nicht die geringste Resonanz vernehmen lassen. Er scheint einer ganz andern Welt anzugehören. Wenn er polnisch redete, so könnte er kaum mehr unverständlich sein als er jetzt ist. Auch selbst die, welche sich mit ihm beschäftigt haben, können seiner nicht froh werden. Sie hören nur auf ihn, weil doch so viel Rumor von ihm gemacht wird. Er soll ein Prophet Gottes sein, so sagt man drüben. Ist er es denn selbst schuld oder sind wir es, daß man seine Stimme nicht versteht?

The Christian World

What It Means to Be a Christian in Soviet Russia

By Kate Bartels Hebley

The author of this interesting study of religious conditions in Soviet Russia is a Churchwoman. She is the wife of an engineer who spent some time in Russia in 1927, and nearly two years in 1930 and 1931, and therefore has first-hand knowledge of the conditions of which she writes.

Much has been written and said about conditions in Russia today. The fields of economics, politics, industrialization, and social conditions have been frequently and rather completely covered—but it seems to me that one field of discussion has been neglected. I have never seen an article published dealing with "What It Means to Be a Christian in Soviet Russia." That is why I have taken this for my subject, as it is an important matter for Christian people to understand, that their sympathy may be aroused for the oppressed followers of Christ who dwell in a land of militant atheism—a land where the mere profession of *any* faith is considered as an act counter to the interests of the government. Faith in a God in the eyes of Communists is to be mercilessly persecuted, and fully destroyed, wherever possible.

It was my privilege to live in Russia with my husband who was engaged on an engineering project; therefore what I write is not hearsay, but actual fact. The closeness of our contact with Russian life, through actually having lived there—through having kept house there, with the help of a peasant maid—made it possible for us to make observations on the life in that country absolutely impossible for the casual tourist. Tourists are taken through the country by graduates of the Communist School of Guides. They are shown exactly what it is desirable that they should see in order that they may take out with them an erroneous idea of Soviet Russia's great experiment—that they may mislead all to whom they may speak concerning it. No one is so sure that he knows all about the Russian question as one who has spent every bit of three to four weeks "studying" it "on the spot," with the able assistance of these trained propagandists.

Nothing pleases the Russian Communists more than to hear the unintentional, but very harmful, utterances of these "returned tourists." No propaganda can be so convincing as that carried by one who believes that he has seen the Five-Year Plan in action—who has studied the Russian system of government through a trip to Russia. It is to offset some of that sort of misguided talk that those of us who really lived in Russia feel that we must make clear, to as many people as possible, some of the truth concerning conditions—which truth is far from being on the surface where "he who runs may read"—but which became clear to us as we took up our lives along with the Russians over a period counted in years rather than in weeks.

The first shock which a Christian receives on visiting Moscow is to find that the ancient Church of St. Basil, in Red Square, has been turned into an atheist museum. The coarseness and vulgarity of some of the posters depicting the supposed depravity of the Church in Russia give one an additional shock when exhibited in chapels where not long since the Holy Mass was sung, according to the rites of the Holy Eastern Orthodox Church, St. Basil's, where once the gem-encrusted ikons were revered, is now daily thronged with workers' delegations, children's groups, and peasant visitors to Moscow—led by ardently atheistic guides, who talk loudly declaiming against the "former superstition," as it is now popular to call the old State Church.

There is no religious freedom in Russia today! Communism, synonymous with militant atheism, is at the helm, and with the short-sighted policy peculiar to fanaticism of any kind there is a definite program of destruction being observed. Sometimes it is active—as when a church is spectacularly blown up. This was the case with the well known Church of the Redeemer, erected by Tsar Alexander III, in commemoration of the defeat of Napoleon. This church was a Moscow landmark, decorated with beautiful mural paintings, and with glorious gilded domes, which stood out reflecting the sunlight long after the rest of the surrounding city was in semi-darkness. It is now but a heap of broken stone and marble! When last we saw it, the skeletal domes, with their shining decoration removed, gave a sad impression of denuded majesty. Zealous atheists are robbing Russia of some of her greatest treasures in the destruction of so many of her handsomest churches.

Despite all of this, and although the carved words of Lenin, "Religion is the Opium of the People," appear at one of the entrances to Red Square, the innate religiosity of the Russian people is as obvious as ever to the thoughtful visitor to Moscow. After all, Communism is a religion—of negative qualities, perhaps—but it has all the zeal of a religious movement. Lenin, their embalmed "saint," lies in Red Square, in what we always termed "the Communists' holy sepulchre." Lines fully as long as those which form for bread, for tobacco, or for any of the necessities of life (for all of which it is necessary to queue up) form before the modernistic sepulchre of Lenin, interpreter of the Law, as laid down by the Communist Moses, Karl Marx.

The desire to prove the incorruptibility of Lenin's body is strange to the average foreigner, but the strangeness is somewhat dispelled by a visit to Kiev. Kiev is the holy city of old Russia. Here the Lavra Monastery dominates the scene of the baptism of the first Russian Christians, by St. Vladimir, in the River Dnieper. Underneath monastery and river are the famous catacombs—far more thrilling to visit than those of Rome and Paris, where the actual bodies of the saints have been removed, to supply churches with relics. In the Russian catacombs one sees the actual bodies lying in the niches where they were buried, still uncorrupted. In the belief of the Eastern Church, a body which remains so is the body of a saint. At Kiev, so scientists say, there is a peculiar quality to the ground which causes bodies to

desiccate rather than to disintegrate—so that a dried, mummified appearance is the only change in the body of one buried there.

It is the firm opinion of many who understand Russian psychology that it is this belief among Russians which causes the Communists to be so exceedingly anxious to preserve intact the body of their "saint"—Lenin. Certain it is that his remarkably preserved remains form a never-failing attraction to hundreds and hundreds of Russians. They stand stoically in all weathers to pass the bier, and to see for themselves the wonder of which they have heard. There is also a Communistic superstition that "when Lenin's body crumbles into dust, Communism may fail—but so long as it remains as it is, there can be no thought of failure."

From a public park in Kiev, dominating the country round, one can see a statue of St. Vladimir. Knowing the tendency of the modern young Russian Communists to leave nothing of that sort standing, we wondered why St. Vladimir had been so spared from the destruction and mutilation common to statues of saints and aristocrats in Russia today. We soon found the reason to be one which peculiarly shows the subtle Asiatic strain of finesse in causing misery and sorrow to believers in Christianity. From the base of the statue of the saint protrudes a loud speaker, from which St. Vladimir may be heard to pour forth anti-religious propaganda of as vituperative a nature as the Communist mind can devise; which is saying a great deal.

This was not the only example of that type of persecution, for it is not at all unusual to see the flag of Communism—the hammer and sickle on an all red background—flying from the green dome of a former house of worship, while the golden cross which had held that position lies in the mud near the door for all to see. That cross lay in that position for months, since it obviously delighted the Communists who entered the now "club house for red atheists" to see the symbol of Christianity brought low just outside their door.

Churches are converted into moving picture palaces, radio stations, soldiers' clubs, garages, and even dwelling houses in some instances. Temporary divisions are put up between pillars, to form rooms where Communists may dwell, to relieve the very real housing problem with which all Russian cities find themselves faced.

A complete disregard for the beauty of the art which decorates most of the church walls characterizes the Communists. They seem to prefer, rather than overwise, to have the nails pierce the hands or feet of some saint painted on the wall where a poster has been placed, to depict atheism triumphant and the Church prostrate. We have visited churches, in numbers, where the most beautiful murals have been wilfully marred in this manner.

In 1929 and 1930, it was decided to remove the bells from Russian churches, because their "noise" awakened workers, and disturbed them, and also because it was considered a wicked waste to have so much valuable and usable metal serving only to call superstitious believers in an outworn creed to worship—a thing which the State considers anything but desirable. The bells were not quietly, nor carefully,

removed. As much noise was made about it as was possible. There is a lasting remembrance of the removal of the bells to Russian Christians, in the fact that they cannot now enter even those comparatively few churches left to them for worship, without using a side entrance! The bells were purposely hung out over the main entrance, and allowed to drop and fall whenever possible, so as to smash the steps, and make entrance from the front impossible. I have never entered a church, unless it had been converted into a museum, or being put to some use other than to that for which is was constructed, without having the removal of the bells brought forcibly to my mind, by the masses of broken steps. They are left just as they were destroyed, as there is no one left with sufficient money to give to have them repaired. Even were the money available, the repair could not be openly undertaken because of the fear of the governmental displeasure. So great is this fear of the active campaign waged by the Soviet government against the Church, that no one dares to champion Christ's cause openly in Russia today!

Despite the actively antagonistic attitude of the Soviet government to any form of worship, it is still possible to go to church regularly in Russia. Just as it is not advisable to deprive a drug addict of his drug too suddenly, so they tell us, it is not thought to be wise to deprive the people of "the opiate of religion," in a too sudden manner. However, it is commonly known that the Communists hope in the near future to have no church left standing, except as a museum and relic of "the former superstition." They admit that this must be brought about by careful atheistic teaching. Their hope is, therefore, in the children, who are taught atheism in the schools. They are encouraged to report to their teachers any religious observance which they may see in their homes. It is by thus inculcating fear of what their own children may inadvertently report, that the present régime hopes to stamp out any religious life in the homes, or the hoarding of religious symbols, such as ikons, crosses, and vigil lamps.

People are constantly asked to turn in to the government any silver ornaments or jewelry which they may possess. Sometimes they are paid a small fraction of the value of what they submit, but often the action of the government is a plain case of confiscation. This is particularly true in the case of religious pictures decorated with gold or silver, as was the custom in Tsarist Russia.

The Five Day Week, with Sundays lost hopelessly in the procession of "work days" and "free days," was another forcible blow at the observance of a regular day for worship. Few people go to church openly, for which reason the morning services are poorly attended, and mostly by elderly peasants, too poor and too old for the officials of the dreaded G. P. U. (State Political Administration—or, in Russion, *Gosudarstnoye Politeecheskoye Upravlyenye*) to bother them. Others who wish to receive the peasant shawls over their heads to hide part of their faces. All religious observance is carried on in this horrible atmosphere of fear. There are sometimes interruptions by young Communists—ruffians inspired with vodka courage in all probability, who enter the

church during the service, stride noisily about without removing their hats, nor ceasing to puff at their cigarettes, making rude remarks directed at priests and worshippers the while. This sort of thing must be borne with patience, lest the authorities claim that the church is a source of needless rioting and a disturber of the public peace. Every excuse is sought to close churches, so that it is necessary that Church people and priests exercise great self-control, to give as little opportunity for complaint against them as may be.

Never a Sunday passed without its quota of anti-religious demonstrations by enthusiastic members of the Young Pioneers, or other Communist organizations. Young Pioneers are somewhat comparable to our Boy Scouts, though entirely different in their ideals, as they are imbued with atheism and class hatred of the most violent sort. These children march in the vicinity of churches where services are being held, and shout and sing noisily the words of anti-religious songs and poems. They carry banners caricaturing priests and Christian beliefs, and are especially active in doing these things on the great feast days of the Church, such as Easter and Christmas, when the streets of all the main cities are filled with anti-Christian paraders.

Much of the parading for this cause or that is far from being voluntary. The actively Communistic elements in every government office (and it must be remembered that there is no private enterprise in Russia now!) make it understood that those not joining in the parade will be investigated and questioned as to the soundness of their politics. Communism brooks no disagreement! Any objection to any Communist platform is immediately put down, as being of "counter-revolutionary" nature, the charge which is more feared than any other! The crime of disagreement with the present régime is the greatest crime in Russia today! It is punishable by death or exile, which is often worse than death.

Since it is wiser to go to church at night time, and then not dressed too conspicuously, so as to avoid notice if possible, it can well be imagined what is the lot of the Russian priest who faithfully serves at his altar, and tries to carry on his work to the best of his ability among his impoverished, frightened parishioners. It is safe to state that every practising priest in Russia is a true hero, doing his duty as he sees it, and expecting daily that he may be arrested for doing so. Many have already met their death through fidelity to their beliefs, and undoubtedly more than we can know of have won the martyr's crown through steadfastness to the right, as they see the right.

No priest may ride a Russian street car in his priestly cassock. As many are so poor that they have no other clothing left, they are forced to walk great distances, in all weathers, through mud or snow, inadequately clad though they may be. Their pathetic, worn figures are common sights, standing near the market places. They have hunted expressions, since they are not allowed to beg, and are always afraid of some young soldier telling them in none too gentle language to "move on."

Food is dropped into their market baskets by the faithful who see them, silently and sadly standing near to the peasant bazaar, where food stuff to augment the supply permitted through the inadequate government stores may be purchased. Priests, however, are counted as "non-productive" members of society, and are thought of as parasites, therefore they are not allowed permission to purchase at these government stores. They therefore live entirly on donations which they receive from fearful but faithful followers of Christ.

Sickness is a sufficiently serious matter when all modern medical science can be brought to the aid of the sick one. But in a land where quite primitive methods of care are all that is available to most cases it is doubly serious. To a priest it is a true tragedy, as no apothecary may sell drugs to anyone without the stamp of a Communist commissar on the doctor's prescription. As only workers are entitled to physicians' care, or to hospitalization, the difficulty which confronts a sick priest is almost beyond description or belief.

Obtaining a lodging is another terribly difficult thing for any person connected with the Church. People do not wish to be thought to harbor enemies to the government. Did not Lenin himself say "Christianity and Communism are incompatible"! It is only by hiding away in some inconspicuous cellar, or by living with the family of some faithful person, that a priest can be sure of a roof to cover him.

Returned tourists often make the criticism that Russian priests looked so "dirty." Who would not look dirty with no possibility of getting any soap, with no place to wash properly, with no privacy, with the necessity of standing in line for hours to get a bit of kerosene with which to light a tiny kerosene stove (the sole cooking apparatus of most Russian households) before hot water could be had. Cleanliness may be seen to be next to godliness—which may be the reason for the lack of interest shown in it by most Communists. The problems presented by even the simplest actions of our life, in this country which has been so impoverished by war, revolution, and political experimentation—under conditions so unfavorable, with a climate which for several months of the year is below zero—must be seen to be thoroughly understood. No one who understands these problems, however, could have anything but sincere and loving sympathy for Russian priests.

Christian burials are conducted under the saddest possible circumstances. Frequently mud and stones are thrown at the priest while he stands over the upturned earth waiting for the lowering of the cheap wooden box which serves as a coffin. Children jeer at them, encouraged by their elders, to use every method of wiping out all remnants of the "superstitious mumblings of priests" over the dead. Communist funerals, without religious rites, are daily to be seen. They are garish occasions in which the procession is preceded by a loud brass band, and stops are made at intervals enroute to the cemetery or crematorium so that speeches may be made regarding the proletarian virtues of the departed comrade, *Tavarish* as he is called in Russian. The

pain which such burial causes to Christian relatives of the departed may well be imagined.

Choir boys and acolytes are penalized for their performance of Church duties by being unable to attend the schools supplied by the Communist government—primarily for children of workers and peasants. The attempt to "liquidate illiteracy" is indeed one of the admirable things about the present system in Russia. However, these children, generally members of the priest's own family, would probably not be permitted to attend the government school—so their loss is less than might be imagined. They are privately taught at home by priests and deacons. The Russian school authorities are particular about the antecedents of all who receive instruction, and are most anxious that no reactionary element creep into the school to spoil the effect of the propaganda which forms so large a part of the school course.

The delightful singing of the really splendid choirs of Russian churches formed one of the main joys of our stay in that country. The service is very ornate, particularly that which takes place on Saturday night. This service is usually attended by crowds of miserably dressed people, humble, and sincere in their manner, saddened by persecution and the hardness of life under proletarian rule. These people are transformed by the partial illumination of the candles into beings of great beauty, and of most spiritual aspects. The absence of electricity, the cost of which is too great for the church to be able to pay, adds rather than detracts from the mystic quality of the scene, for it hides the dirt—and the harsher features, such as garishness of artificial flowers, used to decorate already ornate silver and brass ikons—and it also hides the sad state of disrepair into which so many formerly gorgeous vestments of the clergy have fallen.

Priests alternately sing and read from the velvet and jewelled books of the Eastern Liturgy. The minor tones of the choir ring out at intervals during the service, unaided by instrumental accompaniment. Vigil lights of many colors shine before numerous ikons and these, added to the half-light of candles, cast a glow over the interior, making the attendance at one of these services indescribably thrilling to anyone susceptible to the subtle influences of light and sound. Russian churches are unheated all through the cold winter months, and everywhere one sees the vapor of the breath of choristers, worshippers, and priests, mingling with clouds of incense from the censor. The vapor rises into the darkness toward the dome, where it is usual to have a picture of the Trinity. The mystical loveliness of the significance of this fact seems to be peculiarly well suited to the temperament of the Russian people. It is in attendance at a Russian church, where one may still see the *staretz* (old, impecunious mystics) so often depicted by Tolstoi, in a state of near ecstasy, before the ikon of some favorite saint. One has a clearer understanding of that term "Holy Russia," so long attached to that country, after having attended one of these services. It is still in the Russian church that one comes closest to the soul of Russia—and not in the theaters, over-ridden as they are with propaganda plays, nor in the great industrial centers, to which

the Soviet Travel Bureau directs the visitor, to see "the throbbing pulse of the land of the proletariat."

We can do nothing *material* to aid these oppressed fellow-Christians. Money or food sent to them would be confiscated, and would bring only additional suspicion and trouble on their already weary heads. All that we can do is to continue to remember them in our prayers. Thus, perhaps, through Soul Power, the miracle of their release from persecution may be effected. A chain of prayer offered by thinking, praying, understanding members of other Christian communities—who, in comprehension of the Catholicity of their faith, can think of these Eastern Orthodox Christians as their brethen in Christ—is the only means of helping them. It would seem that we need only comprehend their plight to supply the only remedy possible to us at this time.—*Living Church.*

The Minister and the Hymnal

By Oliver Seth Beltz

The minister owes it to the members of his congregation to acquaint them with the literary beauties of the hymns. We may not consider here the validity of the assertion of some literary critics that hymns should not be called literature. Mr. Reeves has written an entire book* setting forth his reason for classing our hymns as literature, while Dr. Benson asserts that a hymn is something more than literature, that it belongs "with the things of the spirit, in the sphere of religious experience and communion with God." It must be admitted, however, that a hymn has literary limitation. "Emotions of love, joy, peace, hope, humility, confidence, sorrow are legitimate expressions in hymns; but hymns may never express their opposites. Then we must note the limitation of the hymn vocabulary. Prosaic words and prosaic phrases are never permissible in hymns; while on the other hand, ornate expressions, elaborate and fanciful figures of speech,—allowable in most poetry—may not be used in the hymn. Within these limitations there has arisen an interesting hymn vocabulary that has undergone changes, however, that parallel those of the English language in general." The hymn vocabulary of Watts is different from that of the Wesleys, and theirs is different from that of the Oxford and Romantic periods of our hymnody. The rigor and angularity of many of the hymns of the 17th century have given way to the smoothness and elegance of those of the 19th.

Only he who wilfully closes his eyes can escape the beautiful imagery of our hymns. If there were none other, this imagery would alone suffice to place the stamp of literature upon many of the best of them. All have felt the call of the lines by the Roman Catholic preacher-poet, Faber:*

* "The Hymn as Literature."
* Price: Music and Hymnody of the Methodist Hymnal.

"Far, far away, like bells at evening pealing,
The voice of Jesus sounds o'er land and sea;"

and the equally famous line by Mrs. Alexander:

"Jesus calls us, o'er the tumult of our life's wild, restless, sea,"

in which we can see reflected the words of the prophet Isaiah, when he writes: "The wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest."

Every Christian is thankful for these lines, again by Rev. Faber:

"There's a wideness in God's Mercy,
Like the wideness of the sea;"

and all of us have taken heart as we have beheld the Cross from the viewpoint of Sir John Bowring when he exclaimed:

"In the Cross of Christ I glory,
Towering o'er the wrecks of time."

Only in a Milton would we expect imagery equal to these lines by Thomas Blacklock:

"Enthroned amid the radiant spheres,
He glory like a garment wears;
To form a robe of light divine,
Ten thousand suns around him shine!"

or these from the pen of Addison:

"Soon as the evening shades prevail,
The moon takes up the wondrous tale."

Moments of quiet inner reflection are pictured to us in the following immortal lines by Mrs. Stowe:

"Still, still with Thee, when purple morning breaketh,—and
Alone with Thee, amid the mystic shadows,"

and in these by George Matheson:

"I lay in dust life's glory dead,
And from the ground there blossoms red
Life that shall endless be."

It is needless to multiply examples of hymnodic imagery in this paper. Mr. Price calls our attention to the above and many others. Anyone with but an average appreciation for poetic imagery, and with only a meagre understanding of the things of the spirit, will find food for thought in our hymns; and the minister who does not lay hold of this means of direct contact with the inner life of his communicants is hardly using all the means at his disposal for spiritual contacts.

Our hymnals, moreover, contain some of the finest specimens of music whether we view the matter from a melodic or harmonic viewpoint. The hymn tunes are often as exquisite as musical miniatures as are the lyrics with which they are sung, and which as often called them forth. The student will classify them as to style and character, and use them judiciously in the proper place. The tune "St. Gertrude" is proper on certain occasions, but is very distasteful at the wrong moment. No study of the hymn book is complete that fails to give proper attention to the tunes. Some of these tunes, even as the poetry, date far into the mediæval times; some have the flavor of the Reformation. Some rise out of times of great human distress and misery;

some are the epitome of periods of great joy. To be familiar with the history of much of our best hymn music is to find another source of joy and delight—a delight that is the basis of much of the musician's enthusiasm for the music of the church. Certainly this field stands second only to that of the poetic. The writing of an excellent hymn-tune involves labor and genius to a degree appreciated by but few, and such hymn-tunes as "Duke Street," "Regent Square," and "Aurelia" are musical gems that call for a degree of spontaneous creation not always found in larger musical forms.

Modern Tendencies

To the student certain modern tendencies are intensely absorbing; and these in direct proportion to his knowledge of the history of the music of the church. First we must mention the many excellent translations from Greek, Latin and other sources, which not only color our hymnody and our music, but our theology as well. Recent English and American hymnals have an astonishing amount of this translated and adapted material; and one wonders how much of these materials of the past will find a place in the hymnals now in the hands of hymn-book commissions of certain large denominations. A second point of equal interest is the attention by non-liturgical communions to liturgical practices in their order of service, and in their church appointments. Our hymnals reflect this trend in the inclusion of chants, canticles, formulæ, etc. A brief comparison of the present hymnals with their predecessors will teach much on this point. Every minister must be aware of this liturgical trend in present-day religious thought. Some Protestant churches have given this liturgical impulse new life by causing an altar to replace the century old pulpit, platform, etc.

Hymnals emphasizing certain phases of the work of the church, or serving certain groups within the church are to be had in abundance. Thus we have Hymns for Childhood, Hymns for the American Youth, College and Chapel Hymnals, Gospel Hymnals, etc., etc.

It may be an open question how much musical ability a pastor should have, but this much is certain: the musical equipment of the pastor of fifteen or twenty years ago will not suffice today. Music education in the public schools, and the wide influence of the radio have resulted in a new musical taste, the demands of which the wise pastor may not ignore, but which he will call into response in his endeavor to create a desire for the best in hymnody. The pastor should know his hymnal from at least two points of view—the theological and the literary. This implies an historical concept of the origin of hymns, and an understanding of the religious and social controversies of the respective periods. The casual, chance consideration some ministers give to the hymns sung by their congregations accounts for much one feels in terms of indifference to congregational song in some churches; the careless, lifeless song of others, and the resort to a cheap, rhythmical type of hymnody in which the momentary influence of a marked rhythm is accepted as a substitute for the spirit of deep reflection produced by our best hymns. At the bottom of most of these difficulties

are two main factors, the failure to give the hymnal its larger place in the life of the people and the absence of a program of education in church hymnody and in its appreciation. The pastor's preparation for carrying on this work in a quiet, effective way will bring a reward as definite as it is certain, not only in terms of better singing, but in increasing ability of the congregation to appropriate fully the message of its hymns.

There is no easier way to spoil a service and utterly ruin the effect of an excellent sermon than by a careless treatment of the hymn. To make every hymn in a service bear directly on the sermon would certainly be over-organizing the service, yet every hymn should have some relation to the general tone and topic. Many are coming to realize that often the sermon is, after all, not the most vital matter in a service, but rather the degree to which the congregation is drawn into the spirit of communion and worship. If the sermon achieves this end, well and good, but as often the congregation's part in the service through the medium of song is as effective as any means at the pastor's command for arousing the spirit of devotion. To accomplish this it is most important that the hymns chosen be such as will lend themselmes to as spontaneous and hearty self-expression as possible. This again returns us to the fact that only as the pastor knows, yes, feels the thrill of the message of the hymns assigned, can he hope to arouse a real response in his congregation. The pastor who is enthusiastic in the matter of congregational song, and who fosters this enthusiasm by a thorough knowledge of and an appreciation for his hymnal, will have little difficulty in generating enthusiastic response in his congregation through the medium of song; and the stimulus of hearty congregational song is within the reach of every pastor, be his charge ever so humble. The pastor's thorough knowledge of the contents of the hymnal is the basic requirement.—Partial reproduction from *Northwestern University Bulletin.*

Buchmanism

The Canadian Department of National Revenue received $12 in "conscience money" last week. Changed (converted), someone had been guided by God to make restitution. A small thing, this was only one of the many tangible results of a recent Canadian tour by the Oxford Groups, of First Century Christian Fellowship, of Rev. Dr. Frank Nathan Daniel Buchman. In Montreal, Toronto, Ottawa, there had been quiet times, testimonials, sharing, guidance, luminous thoughts. Dr. Buchman lunched with Canada's pious Premier Richard Bedford Bennett. The Groups were welcomed to Montreal by Anglican Bishop John Cragg Farthing. In Toronto a minister of the United Church of Canada, Rev. Dr. James Little, was so changed that for the first time in 20 years he was able to pray successfully. A Toronto businessman and his wife joined in, soon changed their chauffeur.

To the U. S. religious world "Buchmanism," as it has conveniently been termed, is no new thing. Its beliefs and methods are well

known, particularly in New York, Asheville, N. C. and Louisville, Ky., where successful meetings and house parties have been held (TIME, June 8, 1931, *et seq.*). Evangelizing by personal talks in friendly settings, the Groups do no preaching, emphasize personal guidance by God, confession of private sin.

Last week, Dr. Buchman and his 59 Group workers were well started on a great U. S. push. It had begun with a meeting in Manhattan's Waldorf-Astoria, a luncheon to the Press, a ten-day house party at Briarcliff Manor. To anyone who recalled how that stalwart Presbyterian John Grier Hibben drove Buchmanism off the Princeton campus in disgrace for over-zealous proselytizing in 1926, the extraordinary eminence of the Waldorf meeting's sponsors would have been a surprise. On the reception committee were not only such conservative and ultra-socialite names as Mr. & Mrs. Frederic William Rhinelander, Mr. & Mrs. Herbert Livingston Satterlee and Mr. & Mrs. William Fellowes Morgan, but also the most orthodox churchmen such as Bishop William T. Manning, John R. Mott, Princeton's Joseph Ross Stevenson. To be sure some of the namees were themselves surprised.

Absent from New York, Bishop Francis John McConnell had not given explicit permission to use his name, but he voiced no complaint. Later Rev. Dr. Cleland Boyd McAfee (Presbyterian missions) wrote the Groups that he had been listed "by mistake." Nevertheless, the array of sponsors showed that what was once "Buchmanism" and is now The Groups has at last found wide favor in high places.

Born 55 years ago in a Pennsylvania Dutch distilling family at Pennsberg, Frank Buchman studied at Muhlenberg College and Mt. Airy Seminary. Ordained a Lutheran Pastor, he founded at Overbrook, Pa. the first hospice in the U. S. for poor Lutheran boys. A difference with the trustees caused him to resign in bitterness and go abroad. To a religious meeting in Keswick, England in 1908 Dr. Buchman ascribes his first change, a heart-warming experience like the one John Wesley suddenly felt in 1738. Dr. Buchman at once wrote six letters of apology to the trustees. Next year he went to Pennsylvania State College, to be Y. M. C. A. secretary for six years. Thereafter, a sharp-eyed, sharp-nosed, well-tailored modern Wesley, he roamed the world building up a practicable technique of personal evangelism. Frank Buchman has never married, "because I have never been guided to. . . ." Since the Group movement began to take form, he has held no official or salaried position, has never lacked for food, clothing or lodging.

Criticism of the Groups has become routine, centering chiefly in two aspects of their work. Many a theologian objects to the absence of thought-content in it. Typical is the criticism of Yale Divine Halford Edward Luccock in the current *World Tomorrow:* ". . . Superficial . . . a conception of a deity almost completely absorbed in sending down hourly directions to his favorites. . . ." Also, it is objected that the Groups work exclusively among the rich. At Briarcliff last fortnight it was observed that they paid much attention to Curtis B. Dall, the President-elect's son-in-law, who began showing a perfunctory

interest last spring. But it was embarrassing to find that Rev. Warren Badenock Straton, son of the late loud fundamentalist, had also got in, and announced his conversion to the newspapers.

To such criticism, however, a strong case was made by Vice President Bernard M. Hallward of the Montreal *Star*, who was changed during the tour: "If there's any class in the world that needs a mission, it's the dinner jacket class, the up and outs. Moreover, as employers of labor, their influence spreads."

And to all objections there is another answer. Outsiders see a distinct possibility of the widespread revival for which the Groups work. They admit, in many cases grudgingly, what the Groups have repeatedly demonstrated: "It works."—*Time*.

Allah & Opium

Squinting skyward last week, Turks looked for the new moon. When they should see it Ramadan would begin, Ramadan the mystic month in which the Koran was revealed to Prophet Mohammed. This year the first glint of the new moon had a special, dread significance. Turks had been ordered by their stern dictator, Mustafa Kemal Pasha who made them drop the veil and the fez (TIM, Feb. 15, 1926 *et seq.*), that beginning with Ramadan they must no longer call their god by his Arabic name, *Allah*.

No godly man, Dictator Kemal considers that there is no reason why Turks should not call Allah by his Turkish name, *Tanri*. There is no reason except centuries of tradition, no reason except that Turkish *imams* (priests) all know the Koran by heart in Arabic while few if any have memorized it in Turkish. Strict to the point of cruelty last week was Dictator Kemal's decree that muezzins, calling the faithful to prayer from the top of Turkey's minarets, must shout not the hallowed "*Allah Akbar!*" (Arabic for "God is Great!") but the unfamiliar words "*Tanri Uludur!*" which mean the same thing in Turkish.

When imams threatened to suspend services in the mosques and hide the prayer rugs, the Government announced that it was holding 400 brand-new prayer rugs in reserve, threatened to produce "newly trained muezzins who knew the Koran in Turkish and are ready to jump into the breach."

While the old muezzins pondered this threat, Dictator Kemal, feeling his progressive oats, decreed that three recently closed narcotic factories in Istanbul shall never be reopened, decreed further that Turkish farmers must sharply reduce their famed crops of opium poppies. "Thus we accomplish," read a Cabinet manifesto, "our most modern and most civilized duty toward the Turkish nation and humanity."

Nearer and nearer crept the moon to crescent. Ramadan was almost upon Turkey when officials of the Department of Culture (which includes religion) screwed up their courage and told Dictator Kemal that he simply could not change the name of Turkey's god—at least not last week. Already several muezzins had been thrown into jail for

announcing that they would continue to shout *"Allah Akbar!"* The populace was getting ugly, obviously sympathized with the *Allah*-shouters.

Abruptly Dictator Kemal yielded. "Let them pray as they please, *temporarily*," he growled. Beaming, his Minister rushed off to proclaim the glad respite only a few hours before the new moon appeared. "On account of the general unpreparedness of the muezzins and imams," they suavely declared, "prayers may be offered and the Koran recited in Arabic during the present month of Ramadan, but discourse by the imams must be in Turkish."

During Ramadan all Moslems are especially irritable because they eat nothing during the hours of daylight. After the fasting is over Turks will be more tractable, may accept from their Dictator a new name for their God.—*Time.*

Peasant of Konnersreuth

Whether belief in the Peasant of Konnersreuth should be merely belief in her mystical experiences, or whether it should include her extraordinary five-year fast was a question for lively discussion last week in the Roman Catholic press of Germany.

Therese Neumann was born in 1898, eldest of the ten children of Ferdinand Neumann, a poor peddler and tailor of Konnersreuth in northern Bavaria. Never over-zealous in the practice of her faith, she was blinded and paralyzed in 1918, after helping extinguish a fire in the house where she was employed. On May 17, 1925, the canonization day of St. Thérèse of Lisieux ("Little Flower"), Fräulein Neumann regained her sight. Eight days later she called for the priest of Konnersreuth. When he arrived she arose and walked. Later in the year she was taken ill with what a doctor diagnosed as purulent appendicitis. Against his protests she went to church, was well the next day.

On Shrove Tuesday, 1926, Therese Neumann's eyes began to bleed. Stigmata appeared under her heart. On Good Friday stigmata appeared on her feet and hands, later on her head. Doctors were baffled. Then on every Friday, from morning until mid-afternoon, Therese Neumann re-enacted the Passion of Jesus Christ, bleeding profusely, babbling in Aramaic, Hebrew and Latin as well as her own peasant dialect.

Many people accept cures and stigmata at their face value, as mystic phenomena. That the scars and blood exist is well attested. The late Sir William Osler called stigmata, in general, manifestations of hysteria, probably produced by auto-suggestion. The Roman Catholic Church takes no official position at all during the lifetime of a stigmatic, conducts exhaustive inquiries afterwards. Last November steps were taken to discourage pilgrimages to Therese Neumann, as was done with similar European cases (TIME, Nov. 14).

The question interesting the Bavarian church is: is it true, as claimed, that Therese Neumann has taken no substantial food since 1926, and nothing but a daily Holy Communion wafer since 1927? Only once since then has Fräulein Neumann submitted to examination,

and then by four nuns and a physician who it is admitted may well have been prejudiced in her favor. It became known last fortnight that the Bavarian Bishops' Conference had asked Therese Neumann's father to permit an examination for a month or six weeks. The bishops were interested in the fast alone, not in the stigmata and other mystical phenomena which they felt could never be satisfactorily explained by medical examination. Herr Neumann declined, objecting that his daughter would be exposed to "foreign influences and . . . uncongenial surroundings." The news of the negotiations between the bishops and Herr Neumann was made public by accident. Embarrassed, the Bishop of Regensburg was obliged to admit that it was so, that he wished an examination of Therese Neumann in a hospital, under scientific auspices.—*Time.*

Christ, Liberal Protestantism, and Liberal Catholicism

By W. Norman Pittenger

We have become accustomed in recent years to the claim of the Liberal of the Protestant school that doctrinal definition, so far as the Founder of the Christian religion is concerned, is unfortunate and unnecessary. We have been told that all that matters is "the simple gospel," by which is usually meant the Sermon on the Mount. "I am not concerned with all this talk about the relation of Jesus to God," says the Liberal Protestant. "The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man—that is Christianity and that is sufficient for me." He urges that we should get away from discussion about the significance of Jesus in any metaphysical sense, and confine ourselves to an honest attempt to follow His ethical teaching and religious principles.

Now this school of thought obviously has much to commend it to our attention. The sincerity and reverent scholarship of men like Harnack must not be questioned; and it is indeed valuable to be reminded that Christians are bound to take the words of Jesus Christ quite seriously. Far too often they have been content with a formal assent to His person, and have forgotten that the Lord Jesus Himself said, "Not everyone that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven."

The teaching of Christ has a most tremendous significance. But the Anglican Liberal Catholic feels that Liberal Protestantism misunderstands the vital point about that teaching. To put that point dogmatically: the fundamental value of the teaching of Christ is that it helps us to learn, by concrete illustration, the essential quality of His personality. He brought God into the heart of human life; and the Christian vocation is not to follow as closely as possible the precise commands of our Lord, but rather to catch that life of God, to reproduce the "Christ-life" in our own day and generation, under the guidance and with the assistance of the Holy Spirit. As the French devotional writers did not hesitate to say, we are to be *des autres Christs.*

Many years ago, William Blake pronounced his judgment on the attempt to reduce Christianity to an ethic. "If Christianity were mor-

als," he said, "Socrates is the Saviour." It is a hard saying, but we believe that in essence it is true. Jesus is not primarily the teacher or sage; He is the bringer of the divine fire, a fire which is still burning after twenty centuries. Christianity has an important ethical aspect, but that is a by-product; in itself, Christianity is a religion, a relationship between God and man, made effectual through the living Christ in the fellowship of His Church.

What then of the person and work of Christ? From the earliest days Christians have been compelled, as a result of their experience of what He is and has done for them, to put their Lord at the very center of spiritual Reality. Even if it were possible to assert that the gospel of the Liberal Protestant is a "better religion," it cannot be seriously maintained that in point of fact it is Christianity in its proper historical sense. The Christian experience, so far as the main tradition is concerned, has always been that of God made known to men and through man in Christ, who is both an historic figure and a present reality. In view of the current tendency to water down the meaning of Christianity until it has become for many synonymous with proper conduct, we must insist unwearyingly upon that plain fact.

It is really impossible to get behind the religion which is centered about our Lord. Even the gospel narratives were written, not by disinterested observers who were recording historic events, but by convinced believers in Christ. Our only knowledge of "the historic Jesus" is through "Christ in the experience of men," to use the titles of two of Dr. Glover's books. The Sermon on the Mount has never been all, nor even a major part, of Christianity, nor can the Christian religion be defined as a realization of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man as taught by Jesus. From the strictly critical point of view, the Liberal Protestant position is quite untenable. The classical statement of the position, found in Harnack's beautiful *Das Wesen des Christentums*, was completely demolished by the scholarly work of Loisy, Schweitzer, Burkitt, Heiler, Rawlinson, Hoskyns, and others. No matter how much the earlier eschatologists may have exaggerated their thesis, they and their modern followers are clearly right in their insistence that our Lord, both in His own belief and in that of His immediate followers, was the central figure in the central act of history, and that it was as such that He was accepted by the primitive Church.

We do not wish to claim that the full Christian experience of Christ or the developed Christology of the Church may be found in the New Testament. Even if there were much less embryonic "Christology" in the New Testament than there happens to be in actual fact, the essential point which we are here making would remain true. There has always been and under God there always will be, a continual development of experience and doctrine as the Spirit guides the Church into more and more of the truth about Christ. But no matter what may be discovered in the purely critical field, the Liberal Catholic asserts with complete confidence that the total Christian fact—which includes our Lord's life and teaching, His death and resurrection, the primitive attitude towards

Him and the claims (whatever they were) which He made for Himself, the effects of His life and death on the world, the existence of the Christian community, and the experience of His continuing personal activity—this total fact presents an organic whole which can be adequately interpreted in only one way, and in the main that is the way in which the Christian tradition has presented it—as God's supreme self-manifestation to men.

Whatever our Lord may have taught about Himself in His limited earthly life, one thing remains certain: that the Incarnate, Crucified, and Ever-living Christ came almost immediately to have for the Christian community the value of God (and that in no Ritschlian sense), and that in the devotional life of the great mass of humble Christians throughout the ages and today He retains precisely that same place. The ancient principle holds good here as elsewhere in religious experience: *lex orandi lex credendi.* There is an overwhelming *consensus fidelium* behind this Incarnation faith; and we should attend carefully to the witnes of saints and scholars and "holy and humble men of heart."

Liberal Catholics believe that it is possible to develop a doctrine of Christ in line with the best modern thought but loyally maintaining the essential Christian belief in the divinity of Christ. Here we have only tried to show that there is a sound basis for the central Catholic valuation of our Lord. There is no doubt that the doctrine of the Incarnation needs re-statement; and quite certainly the manner in which we conceive this crowning condescension of God to have taken place is not so important as the fact itself. Nevertheless, we must agree with Dr. E. O. James that "upon this bedrock truth the Church must take its stand as the irreducible minimum of the historic faith of Christendom."—*The Living Church.*

Book Review

NOTE—*Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.*
(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)

Treatise on the Gods, by *H. L. Mencken.* Published by Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1930. 364 pages.

We have never reviewed a book by Mencken and if we review this one because it deals with a religious subject, we don't expect much light from it knowing Mr. Mencken's ideas on religion. He says himself, in the preface, that his position with regard to religion is that of amiable skepticism; that he has been (congenitally) devoid of the religious impulse. According to him religion has nothing to do with morals, for it is mainly a theory of causes and only incidentally a scheme of conduct. His own private code, he says, is quite superior to that of most Christians. He doesn't say what this code is but we suppose that kindliness, tolerance and truthfulness are some of the most essential characteristics of it.

If a man has been devoid of the religious impulse from his very childhood, it is not likely that he is a good judge of the value and nature of religion. Few people would be interested in a book on music by a man who claimed that music had never appealed to him, or on painting, by one who admitted that the sense of beauty had early shriveled up within him.

Mencken has nevertheless given years of study to this matter, but apparently not from any longing to be converted from his skepticism, any desire to be ushered into that which to others is the sanctuary of their soul, but to be better able to demolish the claims made for the value of religion and to laugh at the follies of the religionists.

He addresses himself first to the task of explaining the origin of religion. Referring to the biblical story of the flood, he says, the people in experiencing that calamity thought that in some way it was not a natural phenomenon but a cosmic monster that was trying to devour them. One of them, being braver than the rest, struck up an attitude of defiance; and since the water then happened to recede they felt he had exerted superior power. He became a magician, a man who could conquer the gods. Thus the priestly order came into being, whose function it was to conciliate the deity for the benefit of his fellow-men. There has been something of magic in the priesthood ever since, Mencken adds, down to our own time. This comes out very plainly in the sacramental churches. The Sacraments without properly appointed functionaries and fixed rituals are by them considered non-valid.

The fact that in all religions blood sacrifices and rites are offered and practised Mencken seeks to explain in the most absurd fashion. Even in the Christian religion the blood of the Savior plays an essential role. The wine in the Communion is always red, not white. "The Mississippi Baptists who, in fear that even unfermented grape juice might deliver them to the Rum Demon, used coca-cola, but I have never heard of them using soda-pop." Such blasphemous witticisms he uses frequently. The worst, we think, occurs on page 120, where he calls the action of the Holy Spirit, as described in Matt. 1. 18, the exercise of the *jus primae noctis*.

In the next chapter Mencken takes up the varieties of religion. His aim is to prove that all religions using essentially the same practices show thereby that they all are very much alike. And if it be said that the Christian religion has survived all the attacks of the centuries, the reply is that some of the great world religions have almost just as many adherents; furthermore, that Christianity has given up ever so many claims it made in the past and that clearly it is more and more forced by science to give up one outpost after another. The final capitulation can't be far distant.

The efforts of Christian scholars (such as Millikan, Eddington, Osborn, Oliver Lodge) he ridicules as futile. "All of them," he says, "are bred so deeply in the faith that they have been unable to shake it off in their later years despite their training in scientific method and their creditable professional use of it. To argue that the gaps in knowledge which still confront the seeker must be filled, not by patient inquiry, but by intuition or revelation, is simply to give ignorance a gratuitous and preposterous dignity." He adds here a word about the powerful pull of inherited superstition. The only safe skeptic is of the third generation: "his grandfather must have taken the Devil's shilling as a bachelor." Besides, the force of public opinion must be taken in consideration. It is still good form to be religious, especially for men in public life. Coolidge went to church regularly while president; before that his religious duties were taken lightly. And Hoover, after long neglect, became a good Quaker when in the President's chair. Again, "it is too much, indeed, to ask a man bred in a country parsonage and educated at a backwoods denominational college to get rid of his infantile dreads and superstitions altogether, even after a year at Göttingen and a long and useful career in the laboratory. But to be polite to such unhappy amphibians is one thing and to take their incurable piety seriously is quite another."

"Religion," he says, "is never an aid to the establishment of sound moral ideas, but always an impediment. The priest, realistically considered, is the most immoral of men, for he is always willing to sacrifice every other sort of good to the one good of his arcanum—the vague body of mysteries that he calls the truth." "The God of love that theologians preach invariably turns out, on examination, to be a God of harsh and arbitrary penalties and brutalities, just as the brotherhood of man that they preach, brought to the test, turns out to be only a kind of hatred. The love of God, in truth, is only a phantasm. As

Toy says, it is quite unknown to primitive peoples. And among civilized peoples it is far more a fancy to be cultivated than a reality to be experienced."

Mencken's "Treatise on the Gods" is a book by a man who had no use for religion; no, more, one who hated it and all its works. A man under such a violent bias could not possibly write a treatise that would do justice to the subject. It was just as impossible as it was for the late Dwight Hillis to deliver a fair lecture on the "Belgian Atrocities" of unhappy memory. No one can find God who doesn't want to find him. Desperate need sometimes is the gateway to faith, although it is possible even then to maintain an attitude of "unyielding despair" (B. Russell). As far as Mencken is concerned, we are afraid that if the gods don't become too strong for him he will continue to treat them as nonentities. His "Treatise on the Gods" might also fairly be called his "Treatment of the Gods."

Science and Religion. Symposium With a Foreword by *Michael Pupin.* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931. 175 pages.

The question of the relation between Science and Religion is here discussed by twelve of the best minds of England. The fact that so many eminent men could be found for this difficult task shows that the problem has awakened the deepest interest in the leading minds of England in every line of higher intellectual endeavor. This symposium reveals that Science and Religion, as Pupin says, are anxious to walk arm in arm and to aid each other in their exalted mission of making life worth living. The members of this symposium agree that conflicts between Science and Religion are avoidable when each of them avoids encroaching upon the domain which naturally belongs to the other. The realities revealed in the domain of religious thought are not revealed in the domain of the physical sciences. The converse is also true. Religion, as one of the writers puts it, gives man the mastery of his fate, even as Science gives him the control of natural forces.

Professor Julian Huxley, the first contributor, looks at the subject from the standpoint of the evolutionist. He thinks that the most vivifying of all the scientific ideas of the past century is that of the capacity of life, including human life and institutions, for progressive development. This idea has to be accepted by religion. Scientific method, applied to religion, has shown that religious ideas were not fixed from the beginning. Comparative religion reveals the progress from crude and unsatisfactory conceptions to such which keep step with the intellectual and moral development of the race. In the past religion has been but slow and grudging in accepting new scientific ideas. If, in the future, it will be more willing to let in all the new light, the conflict will be over and both can join hands in advancing the great experiment of man of insuring that he shall have life and have it more abundantly.

Professor Sir J. Arthur Thomson, Emeritus Professor of Natural History in the University of Aberdeen, in an article of unusual clarity, declares that both, religion and science are necessary activities of the

evolving spirit of man. Science describes, religion interprets. Science never asks the question why? It never explains the meaning of anything. It observes phenomena, finds that they are all due to the operation of natural laws. These laws are not in the nature of objective, human laws; they establish only the uniformity of sequences. The question as to the ultimate cause of all is never raised, nor of the final purpose and goal.

Religion, on the other hand, is the appeal to some spiritual power back of it all. Under the pressure of adversity, in the conflict with evil circumstances; or under emotional stress, the feelings of exuberant joy or devastating despair, or in the endeavor of the intellect to find a meaning in life: in all this man stretches at the limit of his practical, emotional, intellectual reach—and finds God, he turns to religion. Religion gives him a transcendental, mystical interpretation of life. There need not be a contradiction between science and religion, between seeing in man a descendant from a simian stock and calling him a child of God. The one looks at the beginning, the whence; the other at the goal, the whither.

Science is not the only pathway to reality or truth. But it has made it easier for the religious mood to breathe in the scientific world today than in that of our forefathers. Caprice has disappeared from the world. It has been one of the great services of science to give us a nobler view of God. We no longer expect God to change his laws for us ("Shall gravitation cease when you go by?"). Still, we need not fear that science ever will or can rob us of our faith. If Mind is the highest stage of human development may we not then say with Aristotle that there is nothing in the end which was not also in kind in the beginning? or be brought back to the wisdom of the old words: "In the beginning was Mind (logos) and that Mind was with God, and the Mind was God. All things were made by it; and without it was not anything made that was made. In it was life and the life was the light of men."

There are other papers, by the representatives of religion, such as Canon B. H. Streeter, who, as in his recent book on "Reality", makes the distinction between the sciences that have to do with the quantitive measurement of material things, and religion whose domain is the realm of values. Next, in this line, is Barnes, the bishop of Birmingham. He is well known as a modernist. But he also points out that science has no right nor authority to dogmatize on the reality of spiritual things. To him, he says, the rationality of the universe, the fact that it can be studied and understood by human intelligence, is a proof that the cosmic process is directed by Mind. Man's creation itself must be the result of a cosmic purpose.

Dean Inge, who follows—and could not well be missed in this connection—believes in evolution, but also in a rational purpose in creation. He thinks that the development of thought is in the direction of positing Mind behind and beyond Matter. The former belief in automatic and universal progress has been severely shaken and has given place to an attitude that is more favorable to religion.

Principal Jacks is the last in this group of theologians. He makes the point that science puts the stress on the difference between true and false while religion stresses that of right and wrong. (Reviewer would admit that ethical factors are important in religion but that, nevertheless, the God-conception and its validity are the decisive thing.) He makes one statement that seems very true to us, namely, that in the discussion going on in this book there is a marked tendency to give science a leading part. It is for science to dictate the terms of peace and for religion to accept them. If religion refuses to do so, there is a bad time in store for her. Professor Huxley is explicit on this point. He says: "What science can and should do is to modify the form of religion. It is the duty of religion to accept and assimilate scientific knowledge. If religion refuses to do so she will lose influence and adherents."

It is somewhat startling to hear that in this array of leading theologians, it is only Father O'Hara, the Catholic, who stands out most conspicuously against unconditional surrender. He respects science; he desires to live on good terms with her; but he is not going to be dictated to by it. He will not admit that religion has been brought to her knees by science.

The different attitude of the religious writers in this book and those around Barth in Germany is striking. Here a religion of reconciliation, there of crisis; here the attempt to show the reasonableness of faith, there the slogan *finitum non capax infiniti.* We are not admirers of Barth but we do wish that our theologians could present a more solid basis of the Christian faith than they do in this book.

Prayer. A Study in the History and Psychology of Religion by *Friedrich Heiler,* Dr. Theol., Dr. Phil., Professor of the History of Religions in the University of Marburg. Translated and edited by Sam. McComb, D.D., with the assistance of J. Edgar Park, D.D. Oxford University Press, London, New York, Toronto, 1932. 376 pages, $3.00.

This book is a translation of Dr. Heiler's "Das Gebet", published in 1918. At that time Heiler was still a member of the Roman Catholic Church, but he already occupied an "oecumenic" position, as he calls it, meaning that he had come to see truth also in other Christian Churches than the Roman. Perhaps he even included in that term some "pagan" religions like Buddhism and Taoism. Afterwards, under the influence of Bishop Soederblom, he joined the Lutheran Church in Sweden; later the same in Germany. Although a convert from Catholicism, he still admires many features in that faith, especially the great men and women of mystical piety that church has produced. He also entertains close relations with the Old Catholic and the Eastern Orthodox churches.

His work, "Das Gebet", is a monumental achievement in completeness of information on the subject; in understanding of prayer's real spirit and in the unerring analysis of all its forms, wherever found,

it has never been surpassed. He goes back to the prayer of the primitives; then follows it in its manifestation in Greek civilization; then gives a critique of philosophical prayer. Thereafter he arrives at the main task of his work, which consists in the comparison of mystical and prophetic prayer.

He says there are two ways of approaching God in prayer, that of the mystic and that of the prophet. The one is based on the general desire of the soul—found in all religions—of union with the infinite; the other on the example of the great biblical leaders whom we call prophets.

The philosopher does not believe in a personal God; he is a pantheist at best. With the ancient Stoic fate takes the place of the God-conception. His moral and spiritual ideal is the state of absolute indifference to whatever fate may decree, or of unreserved surrender. We find the same view and the same attitude in the philosopher of modern times. Schopenhauer says, since the Christian conception of God is anthropomorphic every rite or prayer testifies to idolatry. Kant calls the belief in the real presence of God a slight attack of madness. According to him prayer is always a soliloquy, a monologue. The only one engaged in it is the praying person. If we can speak of philosophical prayer at all, it is the humble mood of a finite mind in the contemplation of the infinite. The philosopher often touches hands with the mystic in so far as they both meditate on the riddles of existence, the moral values and aims of life. Still the mystic's prayer is emotional, the philosopher's prayer is cold, "He who has made progress in the good life," says Kant again, "ceases to pray, for candor is one of the first maxims" (he can't believe in prayers so he doesn't pretend). So Heiler seems to be right when he says, "rational philosophical thought means the disintegration of prayer."

Still the great personalities of Christian history all lived in and by prayer. They were sure it was the work of God in the soul, not of man. "That we pray is a divine gift," says Augustine. "Prayer is a divine deed in the human soul," Girgensohn. Religion is not man's discovery, it is God's revelation. Prayer is the expression of all that stirs in the soul, it is not only petition. In the solitude of prayer God is found. There may even be "visions and auditions" if the soul is truly responsive to the divine touch. "Thou, then," says Bunyan, "art not a Christian that art not a praying person."

Coming now to the difference between mystical and prophetic prayer, Heiler says: The God of the prophet has the features of human personality. He reveals himself in history. Moses—not to speak of Abraham—is the prototype of prophetic faith and prayer. His prayer is manly, powerful, victorious, based on God's promises and covenant, and intercession is one of its main elements. The prayers of all the prophets partake of the same character. And this Old Testament type is brought to its perfection in Jesus Christ. His faith in the father is the secret of his power and it finds in prayer persevering, unceasing, rising to the divinest heights—its perfect expression.

All the Christian leaders are molded on scriptural example. The

author now dives into the riches of the Christian past. With an unexcelled universality he quotes from the lives of great Christian personalities of all ages and climes. Luther is mentioned more than any one else in this "hall of fame" of the men of prayer.

The Christian faith in the historical groundwork of salvation, he says, finds its most powerful expression in the Apostolic Creed. The mystic knows only a subjective inner revelation. Luther, Paul and the others cling fast in faith to an historical redemptive deed, the atoning death of Christ, offering an objective guarantee of divine forgiveness.

The prophetic religion is intolerant, in unrelenting opposition to the fallacies and worldly thoughts of the people.

In mystical prayer contemplation and adoration forms the climax of all prayer. In prophetic prayer praise and thanksgiving are secondary to petition and intercession. And this is not strange since prophetic prayer is altogether social in intention, while the mystical prayer aims chiefly at the sinking of the individual in God, or in the infinite.

God's will itself may be altered by prayer. Prayer is able to prevail with heaven and bind omnipotence to its desires, says Spurgeon. Not so the mystical idea. Mysticism is the yearning of the devout person for union with the infinite. In a chapter of deeply searching power, the author probes into the prayer of the mystic and shows how fundamentally different it is from the prophet in its psychic experience, its idea of God; its conception of sin and salvation; its relation to ethics; to the world and civilization; the hope of immortality; its monism over against the dualism of prophetic religion.

We are grateful to the author for making us acquainted with the prayers of the great mystics, of whom he thinks so much; and with those who followed in the steps of the prophets and reformers. He has a very valuable chapter on "prayer in public worship." He thinks only a few reach fully the heights and depths of spontaneous prayer; the great mass needs fixed religious forms and other prayer helps (in books).

"The essence of prayer," he says in conclusion, "is a living communion of the religious man with God, conceived as personal and present in experience, a communion which reflects the form of the social relations of humanity."

This is a great book and cannot be too highly praised or commended. Only about one thing we are not so sure. The author goes very fully and ably into the nature of mystical prayer. That may be very welcome to those who have been affected by the modern trend to mysticism. We others might appreciate still more if he had told us how a life of prayer may be maintained in the world of science. He tells us about philosophy and philosophers and their ideas about prayer. That was all right as long as Germany was the country he was thinking of. Here in America we excel more in science than in philosophy. Wouldn't it have been well if in this English translation he had added a chapter on "how we can still believe in and practise prayer in this world of science"?

Robbing Youth of Its Religion, by *James Halliday.* Henry Holt & Company, New York, 1929. 253 pages.

This book is written by a man who seems to be a member of the Unitarian faith. In his opinion modern youth is largely held back from entering the Church because it is shackled by traditionalism. What the Church teaches about Christ and the Bible is so contrary to modern thought that young people who have passed through up-to-date educational institutions find themselves unable to accept it. They have been accustomed to apply the scientific method to every subject of study and now they are supposed to receive teachings that defy all reasonable belief on the sole authority of the Church and the Bible.

There are plenty of ministers, he says, who are in harmony with modern thought and would like to adjust the old standards of belief to it, but they are afraid of the consequences. The older ministers and the Church at large are so wedded to traditional belief that an unheard-of commotion would be the result and the innovators themselves would risk their position and livelihood.

The writer speaks from experience, he tells us. In fact, the whole book is largely autobiographical. The writer himself was brought up in the old way. The Bible and the creed were sacrosanct in the world where he grew up. In a most interesting way he describes the Odyssey of his youth. As a conventional member of the Christian Church he entered college, with the intention of becoming a minister, in the back of his mind. He registered in the class of a man, whom he calls Professor Markham, in Philosophy I. In a graphic way he tells us how this man ruthlessly uprooted his whole traditional faith. The Bible was a book like all others, with a good deal of superstition, sheer nonsense and worthless ballast. Christ was a splendid man, perhaps the best that ever lived but nothing divine about him; a child of his time and therefore steeped in many superstitions. The Church was a backward institution, that had done more harm than good in its career. It was one of the main hindrances in the way of progress today, and so on.

After a year of such teachings the writer gave up the idea of becoming a minister; after two years he had lost his Christian faith altogether. Now he goes on to say that it was the fault of the Church that he was "robbed of his religion." The Church, by clinging to an antiquated view of the Bible and an impossible body of beliefs, had made him unable to withstand the shock of the scientific method. The crude childish, authoritarian faith the Church had passed on to him collapsed like a house of cards under the onslaught of the destructive criticism of Professor Markham. And the home and the Sunday school were equally guilty with the Church. From them, too, he had received nothing that could survive when coming in contact with modern skepticism and unbelief.

But now follows a chapter that seems to us the most interesting in the book. The writer happens to meet a man who does to him what Philip did to the eunuch. He calls him Mr. Robinson, an old, white-

haired country preacher, formerly a university chaplain. This man, of ripe scholarship and deep spirituality. heals his wounded soul and brings order and peace into his intellectual chaos. He preaches no dogma and no creed; only Christ, the spiritual miracle and our inspiring example. His teaching is summed up in the statement: "The Christian is the person who honestly tries to live out the spirit and the teachings of Jesus. Nothing more. Nothing less." That was the heart of the message of Mr. Robinson. That now becomes the heart of the faith of the author. It rings through all the rest of the book. It is the Alpha and Omega of all his contentions.

Robinson makes light of all creeds and controversial points. To him they only obstruct the real purpose of Jesus. The writer, now a disciple of this revered master, feels, though, that he has a mission to perform. He does not hide his new light under a bushel. He wants to proclaim his own experience from the housetop. He is sure the youth of the land needs a liberator. He makes himself the mouthpiece of all those who need a modern Moses to lead them into the promised land of intellectual freedom.

What is necessary in the way of clearing the road for those who have outgrown the old beliefs? They must have a new conception of the Bible. It would be a good thing, he says, to give them and the world an abridged bible, shorn of all the superstitions and backward material of the old one. The miraculous element must be thrown overboard. A new Christ is needed, not one conceived of the Holy Ghost; but a natural son of Joseph and Mary. Not a deity, a God, but divine, in so far as he is the best man and teacher who ever lived. The Christian needs a Christ who became, not who was. How could a God be our example? The old view of salvation is wrong. Salvation comes by character, not by faith in the blood of Jesus. The physical resurrection of Jesus is an impossibility. His spirit, his cause, his example survives, not his body. The creed, the writer proposes is, naturally, very much abbreviated: God, the creator; Jesus, the inspiring example; the church open to his spirit. And, like above, the *Christian living out the teachings of Jesus.* If the Church can be got to preach such a gospel, he says, the youth will listen and everything will be well.

One might say, in the first place, the Unitarian Church has been preaching that kind of a gospel for some time and we don't hear that their youth is more responsive than that of other churches. It is true that in certain cases where there is one Unitarian church in a place and an able minister in the pulpit, there is a strong popular support and a large youthful element, because the intellectual elite drifts that way. But if there were many churches of the Unitarian persuasion, could they stand the competition? Is it not a general experience that the more "positive" churches attract more people than those of the modernized type?

The writer puts all the emphasis on the ethical fruits of preaching and believing. We agree that a man, a church, a gospel must be judged by its fruits. But the question is, since only a good tree can bring

good fruits, how can a man *become* such a tree? We say, by entering into fellowship with God through Christ. In order to bring us into such fellowship Christ must be more than the inspiring example of the author.

The author lays a heavy emphasis on the necessity of the modern minister to tell his people where the bible and the creed needs a new interpretation. He doubts whether many ministers will have enough intellectual honesty to speak out. It is a hard task, we believe. It requires judgment, tact, courage, information. Still, we have to consider that the spiritual life of the people is built up by affirmation, not by negation; by faith, not by skepticism. If a man becomes first strong and successful in building up, he will in time also be able to broaden the horizon of the people without too much of disturbance and controversy.

We differ indeed greatly from the writer as to the essentials of the new gospel, but the candid, fresh, personal presentation of his spiritual and intellectual development has been highly interesting to us.

Walking and Working With Christ. A Manual of Supplementary Material for use in Catechetical Classes. Board of Christian Education, Reformed Church, U. S. Philadelphia. Teacher Guide, 35c; Pupil Manual, 25c.

Many of us Evangelical pastors have wished for a text-book or guide besides the catechism for our work with the confirmation class. Something that would guide us in leading the child into an appreciation of the church, an understanding of the Christian life and a full dedication to Christ. We always felt that we need more than the catechism with its questions and answers to develop the thinking of the child in understanding his relation to the church, Christ and the whole Christian life.

We also wanted a selection of suitable hymns, poems, and other fitting source material. While Evangelical Fundamentals and Irion's "Katechismus-Erklaerung" were of great help, they did not meet the whole need, especially with the child of today.

Many calls for such a guide or text have come before conferences but to date nothing has appeared. We therefore gladly welcome and urgently recommend the "Manual of Supplementary Material for use in Catechetical Classes," just issued by the Board of Christian Education of the Reformed Church U. S. This Manual provides a guide for the pastor and a manual for the catechumen.

There are seven chapters: 1. The Church, 2. The Bible, 3. Jesus Christ, 4. The Father Whom Jesus Revealed, 5. Learning to Be a Christian, 6. Looking Toward a Christian World, 7. Our Way of Life. Besides these, the Teacher's Guide also has a chapter on "After Confirmation, What?" offering many practical suggestions for the period directly after confirmation. The Pupil's Manual includes a fine outline of "The Church Year."

Each subject is approached under "Getting Ready," beginning with known things; then "Reading Material," stories, books and pamphlets are suggested for use; next "Something to Think About," arousing the child to apply the lessons; finally "Something to Do," definite projects proposed, putting to test the subject taught.

The whole material is handled in a real educational manner. Every pastor will find much help and wealth of material in this course. The booklet is the size of our catechism, paper cover. The price is very low. You will be well repaid for the investment.

H. L. Streich.

Der Weg der dialektischen Theologie durch die kirchliche Welt von **Dr. Adolf Keller.** Eine kleine Kirchenkunde der Gegenwart. 1931. Christ. Kaiser-Verlag, München. 212 Seiten.

Es wird den amerikanischen Leser sonderbar anmuten zu hören, daß die dialektische Theologie schon durch die ganze kirchliche Welt geht. Er selbst fühlt sich von ihr so wenig angesprochen, daß er nicht begreift, was andre Menschen und Völker in ihr finden mögen. Schreiber dieses bemüht sich redlich, Barth und seiner Theologie Geschmack abzugewinnen, aber bisher vergeblich. Das Gefühl, das wir beim Lesen seines ersten Buches, des „Römerbriefs," hatten, daß er ein Fanatiker und ein Pessimist sei und dazu in einem unverdaulichen Stil rede, dies Gefühl haben wir immer noch. Seine Grundthese ist die von dem „qualitativen Unterschied zwischen Zeit und Ewigkeit." Diese These stellt er an die Spitze seines Römerbriefs und er hält sie fest in jedem andern Zusammenhang. Es scheint uns aber so klar wie das Licht zu sein, daß sie weder an dem einen Ort noch an den andern eine Stelle hat. Der qualitative Unterschied zwischen Zeit und Ewigkeit hat mit dem Römerbrief rein nichts zu tun. Der Römerbrief handelt von des Menschen Sünde und Gottes Gnade, welche Gnade dem Glauben geschenkt wird. Der Unterschied zwischen Zeit und Ewigkeit ist eine Betrachtung, welche Barth von anderswoher (Kierkegaard) entlehnt hat, und die ihn jetzt wie eine fixe Idee nimmer losläßt.

Barth muß verstanden werden aus der theologischen Situation, aus der er selber hervorgegangen ist und gegen die er nun reagiert, nämlich der liberalen Theologie. Diese Theologie verwirft er nicht in Bausch und Bogen. Er nimmt ihre historisch-kritischen Resultate an und auf. Aber die Nützlichkeit der liberalen Theologie ist nun zu Ende. Die moderne Theologie hatte Gott hineingezogen in menschliche Erfahrung und menschlichen Besitz. Sie hatte ihn zu einem immanenten Gott gemacht und ihm seine Transzendenz geraubt, und für diese göttliche Transzendenz kämpft B. nun früh und spät. Gott ist im Himmel, der Mensch auf Erden, die beiden kommen nie zusammen („finitum non capax est infiniti"). Der Mensch kann Gott nicht einmal suchen. Er kann seine Not vor Gott erkennen und auf Gott hoffen — das ist alles. Der Mensch kann Gott nie zum Objekt machen, ihn nie besitzen, weder im frommen Bewußtsein (Schleiermacher), noch in der religiösen Erfahrung (Pietismus), noch in dem Rausch der Erweckungserlebnisse. Die „Todeslinie," der „qualitative Unterschied . . ." hält ihn stets fern von Gott. Auch in Christo und durch ihn wird diese Kluft nicht über-

brückt. Er ist zwar der Offenbarer Gottes, aber zugleich ist er auch Gottes größte Verhüllung (verstehe es wer kann!) Barth legt bekanntlich mit aller Wucht den Nachdruck auf das **Wort Gottes,** in dem sich Gott offenbart und auch die Notwendigkeit solcher Offenbarung. Er gibt aber dies Wort, auch Lehre und Leben Jesu, in solcher Weise der Kritik preis, daß man nicht weiß, was denn noch vom Worte übrig bleibt.

Seine **dialektische,** d. i. sich in Widersprüchen bewegende, Theologie, verhindert es, daß man sich je von seinem Standpunkt ein feststehendes Bild machen kann: „Die Bibel ist das fehlbare Wort des Menschen und das unfehlbare Wort Gottes. Gott ist der unbekannte Bekannte und der bekannte Unbekannte. Die Auferstehung ist das Fundament unsers Heils, aber doch keine historische Tatsache" usw.

Der Mensch, so hörten wir, kann Gott nicht besitzen, er kann auch nicht ein sittliches Leben auf Grund seines Glaubens erbauen. Als B. im Römerbrief zum 12. Kapitel kommt, dem Teil, den wir etwa den **ethischen** Teil nennen, überschreibt B. denselben: „Die große Störung." (!)

Aller Glaube an die „Gegenwart" Gottes oder das Streben nach einem höheren Leben wird von B. (und Brunner) als Illusion und Selbstbetrug verworfen. B. hat keine Geduld mit Pietisten und Mystikern, aber seine schärfsten Pfeile richtet er gegen die religiöse Selbstgefälligkeit und christliche Gewißheit, welche „wir glücklicher Weise nur unter Theologen finden."

Für die Kirche als Institution interessiert sich B. wenig oder gar nicht; ja sie findet seine nachdrückliche Verdammung. Aeußere und Innere Mission sollte sie, die Synagoge des Satans, gar nicht treiben. Die Verkündigung des Wortes Gottes ist ihre einzige Aufgabe.

Es ist nicht nötig, daß wir uns noch weiter auf B.s Kritiken einlassen, oder aufweisen, daß wir und er in vielen wesentlichen Punkten nicht zusammen kommen können. Es handelt sich ja nicht darum, was wir von ihm denken, sondern was Keller in seinem Buch sagt. K. scheint viel von B. und seiner Theologie zu halten. Er sagt, B. habe dem elenden Kulturprotestantismus, der schon durch den Krieg recht erschüttert war, den Todesstoß versetzt. B.s Pessimismus sei besser als übelbegründeter Optimismus. Wenn B. mit prophetischer Macht und Schärfe unsern Schaden aufdeckt und unsere Ratlosigkeit, so tue er unserm Geschlecht denselben Dienst, wie die Reformatoren dem ihrigen. Es sei der Geist Kalvins und Luthers, der in B. erstehe und der mit gleicher Macht den Ton lege auf das Sola Fide Luthers und das Soli Deo Gloria Kalvins.

Deutschland, so sagt K. weiter, hat B. ein offenes Ohr geliehen und seiner Predigt Raum gegeben mehr als irgend ein Land. Die Theologen haben sich mit ihm auseinandergesetzt, und die Jugend hat sich begeistert für ihn erklärt. Natürlich kann nicht erwartet werden, daß das Kirchenregiment — Leute wie O. Dibelius, der „das Jahrhundert der Kirche" so beredt besungen hat, sich für Barth begeistern werden; noch daß die Pietisten oder die Lutheraner (Orthodoxen) ihm zufallen. Er ist zu sehr Verneiner und Streittheologe; doch überall, wo Leben ist, spricht man von B., und wo er hingreift, sprühen Funken.

In Holland, Dänemark ist B.s Einfluß stark, in Frankreich und den nordischen Ländern weniger, in Schottland ist günstiger Boden. In England und Amerika fällt es ihm schwer, Eingang zu bekommen; besonders in unserm Land. Für das „Social Gospel" und „Reichsgottes"-Arbeit hat B.

wenig Verständnis. Wenn sich der amerikanische Aktivismus müde gelaufen hat, sagt K., dann wird Barth an die Reihe kommen.

Das Buch ist interessant nicht nur, weil es überall den Spuren B.s nachgeht, sondern auch weil es eingehend und verständnisvoll die Situation und Geistesart aufweist, die der Barthianismus in den einzelnen Hörern vorfindet. Er sagt abschließend, daß die Barthsche Theologie sich mit der ökumenischen Bewegung insofern berührt, als beide es mit Fragen zu tun haben, mit denen die ganze Christenheit, nicht nur dies oder jenes Land, ins Reine kommen muß.

Es sei das Buch bestens empfohlen, besonders denen, die sich durch Schwierigkeiten hier und da nicht abschrecken lassen.